THE ART BINDERY
BERKELEY, CAL.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY

A JOURNAL OF THE FAITH, WORK AND THOUGHT OF CHRISTENDOM

Edited by Silas McBee

Volume III

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, EDINBURGH, MELBOURNE, AND BOMBAY
NEW YORK: GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
1915

KS1
C766
V3

COPYRIGHT 1915
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

CONTENTS

Volume III

March to December, 1915

Anglican Communion and Christian Unity, The.
By H. K. Archdall..... 346

Archdall, H. K.
The Anglican Communion and Christian Unity... 346

Authority and Orthodoxy.
By E. J. Widdows, M.A..... 398

Batiffol, Mgr., Litt.D.
The Catholic Church and War..... 194

Binyon, Gilbert Clive, M.A.
The Gospel and The Modern Situation..... 18

Buckham, John Wright, D.D.
A Unifying Theology..... 814

Byzantium the Preserver of Orthodoxy.
By Professor Ivan Ivanovich Sokoloff..... 66

Call of the Church to the Nations, The.
By Professor Allan Menzies, D.D..... 718

Catholic Church and War, The.
By Mgr. Batiffol, Litt. D..... 194

Chandler, The Right Reverend Arthur.
Uniformity: Federation: Unity..... 731

Cheshire, The Right Reverend Joseph Blount, D.D.
Thomas Atkinson..... 455

Christianity After the War.
By Newman Smyth, D.D..... 370

Christianity in Germany During the War.
By Professor Dr. Adolf Deissmann..... 555

Christianity Psychologically Examined.
By Friedrich Niebergall, D. Theol..... 383

Church and War, The.
By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B..... 321

Churches, The War and The Future, The.
By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D 54

Coming of Archbishop Evdokim, The.
By Vera Vladimirovna Jelihovsky Johnston..... 648

Comment on Professor Winslow's Paper.
By William C. Gorgas, A.B..... 851

Congregationalism and Its Ideal.
By Meredith Davies, M.A., B.D..... 546

Constructive Sketch of St. John the Divine, A. Part I
By The Most Reverend Evdokim..... 475

Constructive Sketch of St. John The Divine, A. Part II.
By The Most Reverend Evdokim..... 753

Controversy Between Saint Paul and Saint James, The.
By Charles Johnston..... 603

Davies, Meredith, M.A., B.D.
Congregationalism and Its Ideal..... 546

Deissmann, Professor Dr. Adolf.
Christianity in Germany During the War..... 555

Dewick, Edward Chisholm, M.A.
Evangelicalism in the Church of England: Its Present Position and Future Prospects..... 800

Dinsmore, Charles Allen, D.D.
Newman and Bright..... 231

DuBose, William Porcher., M.A., S.T.D., LL.D.
Why the Church—In Christianity..... 249

Dynamic View of The Deed of Christ, A.
By F. Herbert Stead, M.A..... 428

Ecclesiastical Honesty.
By Bishop Francis J. McConnell, D.D..... 119

Education and The Constructive Aim.
By Edward A. Pace, Ph.D., S.T.D..... 584

Evangelicalism in the Church of England: Its Present Position and Future Prospects.
By Edward Chisholm Dewick, M.A..... 800

Evdokim, The Most Reverend.
A Constructive Sketch of St. John The Divine, Part I..... 475
A Constructive Sketch of St. John The Divine, Part II..... 753

Fact of the Resurrection of Jesus, The.
By Dr. Max Meinertz 159

Fellowships of Hope.
By Nathaniel Micklem, M.A 825

Footnote to Buddhism, A.
By Arthur J. Gossip, M.A 620

Forsyth, Peter Taylor, M.A., D.D.
Lay Religion 767

Glover, Terrot Reaveley.
The Unexplored Factor in the Gospel 444

Gorgas, William C., A.B.
Comment on Professor Winslow's Paper 851

Gospel and the Modern Situation, The.
By Gilbert Clive Binyon, M.A 18

Gossip, Arthur J., M.A.
A Footnote to Buddhism 620

Haspels, Rev. C. F.
Tolstoy 865

Herbermann, Professor Charles G., Ph.D., LL.D.
Man, Nature, and God 854

Hodgkin, Henry T., M.A., M.B.
The Church and War 213

Horsefield, the Late C. S. W., B.A.
National Contributions to Christianity 267

Intercommunion.
By Dugald Macfadyen, M.A., F.R.Hist.S 740
Thomas Alexander Lacey, M.A 745

Jeremy Taylor: His Doctrine of Toleration.
By Frederick James Powicke, Ph.D 657

Johnston, Vera Vladimirovna Jelihovsky.
The Coming of Archbishop Evdokim 648

Johnston, Charles.
The Controversy Between St. Paul and St. James 603

Knowledge and Love.
By Dr. A. F. de Sopper 414

Lacey, Thomas Alexander, M.A.
Intercommunion 745

Lagrange, Père M. J.
Some Points Recently Gained in the Study of the Epistle to the Romans 495

Lay Religion.
By Peter Taylor Forsyth, M.A., D.D 767

Macfadyen, Dugald, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.
Intercommunion 740

Man, Nature, and God.
By Professor Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D., LL.D. 854

Manning, William Thomas, S.T.D.
The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Unity 679

McConnell, Bishop Francis J., D.D.
Ecclesiastical Honesty 119

Meinertz, Dr. Max.
The Fact of the Resurrection of Jesus 159

Menzies, Professor Allan, D.D.
The Call of the Church to the Nations 718

Michelet, Professor S., D.D.
The Present Theological Crisis in the Church of Norway 104

Micklem, Nathaniel, M.A.
Fellowships of Hope 825

Mulert, Lic. Hermann
The Nature of Catholicism as It Appears to Protestants 697

National Contributions to Christianity.
By the late C. S. W. Horsefield, B.A 267

Natural Law and Belief in Miracle.
By Professor Carl Stange, D.Theol., D.Phil 137

Nature of Catholicism as It Appears to Protestants, The.
By Lic. Hermann Mulert 697

Neutrality of the Churches in the War Against Disease, The.
By C.-E. A. Winslow, M.S 834

Newman and Bright.
By Charles Allen Dinsmore, D.D 231

Niebergall, Professor Friedrich, D.Theol.
Christianity Psychologically Examined 383

On the Character of the Swedish Church.
By the Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, D.D., Hon.D.D 281

On the Soul of the Church of Sweden.
By the Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, D.D. Hon.D.D 506

Pace, Edward A., Ph.D., S.T.D.
Education and the Constructive Aim 584

Powicke, Frederick James, Ph.D.
Jeremy Taylor: His Doctrine of Toleration 657

Present Theological Crisis in the Church of Norway, The.
By Professor S. Michelet, D.D 104

Problems of the Eastern Orthodox Church in America.
By Archpriest Leonid Turkevich 311

Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Unity, The.
By William Thomas Manning, S.T.D 679

Religious and Catholic Awakening in France, The.
By Professor Jean Rivière 328

Rivière, Professor Jean.
The Religious and Catholic Awakening in France. 328

Schäder, Professor Erich, D.Theol.
Theocentric Theology: In Peace and in War 39

Schmidlin, Professor Joseph, D.Theol. et Phil.
War and Missions 790

Selbie, W. B., M.A., D.D.
The Churches, The War and The Future 54

Smyth, Newman, D.D.
Christianity After the War 370

Söderblom, Archbishop Nathan., D.D., Hon.D.D.
On the Character of the Swedish Church 281
On the Soul of the Church of Sweden 506

Sokoloff, Professor Ivan Ivanovich.
Byzantium the Preserver of Orthodoxy 66

Some Points Recently Gained in the Study of the Epistle to the Romans.
By Père M. J. Lagrange 495

Sopper, Dr. A. F. de.
Knowledge and Love 414

Stange, Professor Carl, D.Theol., D.Phil.
Natural Law and Belief in Miracle..... 137

Stead, F. Herbert, M.A.
A Dynamic View of the Deed of Christ..... 428

Talbot, The Right Reverend Edward Stuart, D.D.
The Topic of Unity..... 1

Theocentric Theology: In Peace and In War.
By Professor Erich Schäder, D.Theol..... 39

Thomas Atkinson.
By The Right Reverend Joseph Blount Cheshire, D.D..... 455

Tolstoy.
By The Rev. C. F. Haspels..... 865

Topic of Unity, The.
By The Right Reverend Edward Stuart Talbot, D.D..... 1

Turkevich, Archpriest Leonid.
Problems of the Eastern Orthodox Church in America..... 311

Unexplored Factor in the Gospel, The.
By Terrot Reaveley Glover..... 444

Uniformity: Federation: Unity.
By The Right Reverend Arthur Chandler..... 731

Unifying Theology, A.
By John Wright Buckham, D.D..... 814

War and Missions.
By Professor Joseph Schmidlin, D.Theol. et Phil.. 790

Why the Church—In Christianity.
By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D., LL.D. 249

Widdows, E. J., M.A.
Authority and Orthodoxy..... 398

Winslow, C.-E. A., M.S.
The Neutrality of the Churches in the War Against Disease..... 834

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Topic of Unity

By Edward Stuart Talbot, D.D.,

Bishop of Winchester.

I lately received through the much-honoured Principal of the University of Aberdeen (Dr. George Adam Smith) an invitation to deliver this year a lecture annually given and known as the Marble Lecture upon some topic of religion. In sending the request the Principal said that by doing so I might render some service to the cause of Unity. His words suggested my choice of a subject: and emboldened me to think that I might attempt to address a (mainly) Presbyterian audience on the subject of Christian Unity. It was afterward suggested to me by one of the most competent of my hearers that what I had said would be suitable for the pages of The Constructive Quarterly, and by the Editor's kindness, it is now submitted to his cosmopolitan audience.

I spoke as follows:

The topic of unity is the topic of the hour and of the generation. It is not that we suppose that even in the time of the youngest of us Presbyterian and Episcopalian will be drawn into one. Do we deserve so great a blessing after all the sinning against truth and charity of our forefathers and of ourselves? But we feel the Holy Spirit stirring amongst us, and we elder men know by experience how fast perspectives change and forces shift, and will not limit the possibilities of good any more than the risks of danger which the leavening and transforming forces carry in their breast. That there is this trend and this drawing towards unity is a thing for which we ought to thank God upon our knees, while we join with our thanksgivings our earnest and fearful prayers that He would by His Spirit guide and guard what He Himself has prompted.

In what way does such a time predispose us to handle unity?

The most obvious answer, and one which is most commonly given, is that we should cut back the overgrowth of systems and doctrines till we lay bare the essentials: that having these we shall be content: that for the rest we may note and encourage any amount of opinions of various value, and express ourselves in all manner of different ways of word and usage. The way of unity is to be found by the simple process of "scrapping" differences.

I am not going to deny that there is any truth in this. Some differences may well be mental lumber: and others may quite rightly be dealt with by the gentle expedients of mutual recognition or allowance. Nor is the distinction between primary and secondary truths, though often misused, a valueless distinction.

But the method is totally inadequate: it is as shallow as it is pretentious and facile. For, first, the essentials dwindle, if we approach them in this way, towards a

vanishing point. There is nothing which is not contested: Christianity itself thins away by the elimination of all positive assertions till it becomes something as faint as the tinge of a civilization or a morality. And then secondly in the process of elimination the things treated as most vital and found most precious by their various holders are too commonly thrown aside. The canvas which would have helped to waft the ship has been close-reefed out of use for fear of the gale.

I do not feel that I have any use for this method. Let us look more fully at an alternative. It is tempting to describe this as a method of combination, in contrast to one of elimination: and to explain it popularly by saying that it seeks unity by bringing together what is positive and valuable in competing systems and institutions. But this, too, has a rather cheap character: it comes too close to what the old Oxford satire ascribed to Hegel's philosophy: "that something and nothing are one and the same," and professing to treat everything as valuable, it comes near to the conclusion that nothing has any particular value. We must at least go rather farther round if we are to justify a method of the kind.

It is a platitude about the deepest truths, the truths of religion, that they are simple, and yet exceeding deep. There is nothing simpler than Jesus Christ. He is, in a sense, the most natural thing in the world: for He is just Man, as Man should be. And yet like the disciples, as we follow Him, "we are afraid": and in His simplicity we find by degrees, as the Spirit shows them, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, nay "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." This at any rate was the experience of His contemporary, Paul. We learn, bit by bit, what ethical, historical, philosophical contexts must be pondered for the full understanding of His "simplicity"!

Add to this another truism, viz.: that these simple-

deep, deep-simple things are often better described by speaking of them in two ways than in one—sometimes in more than two ways: by opposites or "antinomies" which are somehow in unity, unity of truth, or unity of life. Thus for example (if a truth so familiar to all thinkers needs illustration), it is more or less natural to all religious people to think of God both as personal and as infinite, as being indeed Himself far more deeply than we are ourselves, and yet as being Infinite Goodness and Infinite Love, and philosophically not as distinct from all, but as including all.

Again, to give another instance, religion is necessarily thought of as "otherworldliness" or the faith of the Unseen: and yet as a believing or reverent treatment of life and its contents. The fact that in our common thinking we make more or less satisfactory reconciliation of these opposites, and know that they are not really opposed, does not prevent the contrasts from being real.

With such thoughts in mind let us observe what inevitably happens in religious history and development. Out of the fulness of the truth come the opportunity and the material for division. Its different parts or principles do not commend themselves alike to all, but to different men in different proportion and degree. Add differences of circumstances and of period, and, as time goes on, the influences of reaction.

Will not two consequences follow? (1) that the partial truths held intensely, and emphasized by repetition and controversy, will tend to fall apart, to be aloof from one another, and even to oppose one another? and (2) that each uncontrolled by the other, and suspicious of the other's control as a kind of tampering with itself, will tend to grow out of proportion,—to hypertrophize, if you will allow the word,—drawing into itself more than its share of the soul's earnestness and the mind's thoughts?

I should like to emphasize these two results: because I

think we have in them at once some explanation of our differences, and some hope of remedy. But we have not yet said all. The mischief goes deeper. For bring now the facts of religious difference into the sphere of common life, where they touch and blend with the faults and passions of men, with their egotisms, and prejudices, and obstinacies, and tempers: and is not the material of bitter controversy and contention complete? I would add to these elements of mischief one in particular, a lack of mutual reverence for each other's convictions and witness. So is scorn added to contention.

We shall note now that we have arrived at a state which is exactly in contrast with the ideal one. In the latter unity of truth and life keeps together in rich and fruitful combination different ways, truths and temperaments. In the former they have fallen apart, with loss of vitality and proportion, with increase of strident self-assertion and controversy.

I think that we have here in the abstract and in brief a largely exhaustive analysis of the history of Christian divisions.

Have we not, therewith, some suggestions towards unity? and may it not be that in the "shaking" of the things of faith and system which is so characteristic of our time we may be led (in order that "the things which are not shaken may remain") to look into the essentials, and to find them partly in the deep and great things which we share together and hold in common, but partly also in things which one body may have clung to while others let them go, or have expressed vividly while others have slurred them?

Such considerations, however, albeit true and significant, are very abstract, and if they are to be of service it must be by special application. It is upon this that I would venture in a critical instance.

Consider what we are confronted with in the religion of the Christian world, broadly taken. We see one highly

organized, closely united body, the Roman Catholic, with a full system of discipline, ordinances, practices of devotion, and a sharply defined body of doctrine. And then we see, in broad contrast, a quantity of life which does not acknowledge organization, or makes the least of it and for which the essential things are an inspiration, an influence, an elevation of morality, a quickening of religious intuition. Within this second region we find the Plymouth Brethren and Society of Friends (Quaker), but we find also the immense number of people who, labelled or unlabelled outwardly, are in substance Christian individualists pure and simple.

And between these two we find bodies such as the Anglican Church and the old Presbyterian Churches, which in different degrees are opposed to both these alternatives, and yet share something with both: something of the organization and form, something too of the individualism and the stress on what is spiritual or moral as being the one thing needful, which attempt in fact a combination of order and freedom. There is evidently here room for internecine strife between the extremes, and for much confused battling at many points in the line. There is room, in other words, for what has filled many chapters in Church History.

But we are today on the lookout for a more hopeful treatment of the matter, which would find the explanation of all this in the falling apart of things which should have been blended, and the unnatural divorce of things which God has joined together: and, again, in the hardening into antagonisms of what should have been wholesome variations, and mutually helpful and instructive differences.

It would be easy to illustrate this by dwelling on the old and constant oppositions between those who lay stress respectively on form and spirit, those who incline naturally to discipline or to liberty, those for whom corporate or individual achievements are respectively

the most important. So to consider the matter is I think to become increasingly impressed with the truth that these are mutually necessary things: but also with the immense difficulty of getting this truth effectively recognized.

But I would rather approach the matter in a somewhat different and more definite way, judging it not by generalities as to human temperament, but by the specific standard of the Christian religion.

It is of course perfectly clear that just because the Christian religion is so true, and therefore so inclusive of the different parts of truth and elements of life, it will have been especially exposed to the dangers which come from the intestine warfare of the different parts of its content. It would be easy to enlarge on this, and hardly possible to exaggerate its importance. But I pass it by, in pursuit of something which seems to me to be even more distinctively Christian—something which is incidental to it as a Divine Revelation.

I would ask you to look at the Christian fact or facts as they are found in the New Testament. I seem to see that they have two characteristics: First, they are so human. They start with the life of a Man: the power in them is that of human example and influence; their fruit is the renewal of human life and its endowment with the human things of love, joy, peace and the like: and by their fruit they claim to be judged. They own affinity as the Apostle so glowingly tells us with all that is best in human life, whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report: they renew and enlarge and deepen all fair human things: they set upon them the stamp and fill them with the power of God. Accordingly this human quality, primarily of the Lord Himself and the Gospels, but also of the disciples and the other New Testament writings, has proved and accredited itself over and over again to men's consciences; the power of it has been, as He said that it

would be, a leaven passing into the mass of human life with increasing power.

I have tried to speak of this clearly, though briefly, and I think that it hardly needs insistence. It means so much that to many it may almost seem to mean everything: and if we complete it by saying that all this human goodness is linked with, or springs from, a great reinforcement by Christ of belief in God, and of confidence that God is with the right and against the wrong, we have said all, or almost all, for which, to innumerable people, Christianity really stands.

But it is not all: and left to itself it suffers that which as we have seen happens to any half-truth. It loses its own vitality: it becomes combative against that with which it should be combined. In the present case the human and moral power of Christianity tends to shade off into general morality, or such a version of Goodness as is congenial to the particular time or people; it comes to be regarded as one product, perhaps the highest, of human history, till at last its disciples are startled to find that its mild and, as they thought, unquestioned Empire is challenged by other forms of moral teaching, claiming, perhaps, to be more virile, robust and stimulating, but at any rate to treat it as a transcended phase of ethical history.

But, I repeat, it is not all. What then else, other, and more is in the Christian Fact or facts? Something which is harder to describe, but not because it is obscurely there. Jesus declared that every teacher instructed unto the kingdom of heaven was like an householder bringing forth out of his treasure things, new and old. If we take "the old" as being what in a phrase once famous we may call "the republication of natural religion," and the stimulus to natural morality, what was "the new"?

Plainly I think that which is implied in the words which tell of something which has come into the world, a light which shines in darkness, a life which quickens

what was dead. A "new thing," "not as the Scribes," "words of eternal life," a "word with power," that which was from above among those who were from beneath: a life and a death by which God fulfilled something of which He had given glimpses to men in the past.

You recognize this without more words: you recognize too that, new as it was, it was not abruptly and unintelligibly new. For it came in a people who had been somehow trained to believe that God had done and was doing and would do among them something altogether special. The faith in the intervention of God to call their first father Abraham, to bring them to birth as a nation by coming down to deliver them out of Egypt, to raise them to life from national death, to use men who came saying simply, "the Word of the Lord came true"—and with this faith the Hope of a great Salvation fashioned, none knew exactly how, but still there, strong and ineradicable,—all this was built up into something, a new thing in the world, which Jesus crowned, which He made intelligible by completing it, which He made to be, and then sent on into the world which He left. For the thing that came among men, the thing (I use a poor word) which inspires the New Testament in every page is not a memory only, nor a teaching, nor a school, but something greater and fuller than all these. It is a life, a new life, a life consciously drawn from a Divine Gift, new though from the Eternal Source: a life of the Spirit of God in men; it is a life which having begun in Jesus Christ has passed over into men with power, power ever fresh and new because always from Him: a life which draws men into a body and company and society just as the life in the plant builds up into itself the atoms of earth and air and water which go to make the plant's structure. It is a life which has not so much sprung up in men as laid hold upon them: they are "apprehended by Jesus Christ." And with it is intertwined a Truth: "The Life is the Light of men," and a power, a power of

God unto salvation. That which is old because fulfilling is also new because redemptive. The life goes forward armed with an armour of God to encounter human enmity, to stand before rulers and kings; and more to face those dark shapes of spiritual evil which its own light detects and challenges.

Here, then, incontestably true and historically real is the other aspect of the Christian facts; they mean the coming and the continuance of the "Kingdom of His dear Son," into which we "are translated" from the ordinary life of men; and, as we watch it, it takes shape in that which is called the Church: and the life expresses itself in words, felt to be inspired, which became its Scriptures; and in ordinances, which are not instructive only and symbolic, but life-giving; and in all the manifold ministries of men laid hold of by God for ministry, and given as gifts to their fellowmen for the work of building up the body.

Shall we not be right in saying that the religious task of our time (not of course exclusively, but in a quite special way) is to see how we can be assuredly loyal to this most challenging, most supernatural, most indispensable aspect or character of the work of God in Christ and yet avoid the dangers which beset it. For that they do beset it is a fact writ large. "*Corruptio optimi pessima.*" The possession of revealed truth is a dangerous thing for a being so proud, so selfish, so insincere as man. The evils of a half truth, exaggerated, uncontrolled and unbalanced are to be seen in all that is rightly resented as ecclesiasticism; in clerical exclusiveness and orthodox contempt, in Ultramontane assumption, in Puritan scorn of whatever is not Puritan, even in such a teaching as that of your brilliant young Presbyterian divine who, a generation ago, in order to extol the work of grace, told us that all human goodness apart from regeneration was as waxwork compared to reality. Such positions as these are so unpopular that no stress of criticism upon them is needed. But if they are "the

corruption of the best", and the best is an inestimable treasure and gift of God committed to human keeping, our real task is to preserve most loyally what He has given, keeping it as clear as ever we may of these human blunderings and faults. And it is just here that I believe we have most need of Christian unity, and that we could help one another to do unitedly that over which separately we bungle.

Let me try to make this plain.

Everywhere and in all religion it is the objective side of religion which, at any rate for us Westerners, it is hardest to preserve. Or, speaking more simply, in all religion there is God's part and there is man's part. And for us because we are we, and because God is out of sight, it is God's part which is hardest for us to realize. We know our own prayers, we feel dimly for His listening and reply; we know our own aspirations and efforts, we hardly discern the Eternal Truth and beauty towards which we aspire, or the Divine Government which uses or overrules what we do.

Now Christianity has lightened this difficulty. It has shown us the Father. It has given shape and substance in Jesus to God's action and Will. We have an Object there within our ken.

But the difficulty is too old and deep to be destroyed. We are still meant to live by faith and not by sight. Jesus too is withdrawn from us. We are more sure that we desire to be Christians than that He is at work to make us such.

But here is our special task.

It is laid upon us in charge to treasure and guard the wonder of a God-given truth, of a new life working among men to transform and renew them, of a Name which is not only a Name of human excellence, and achievement, but of Divine rescue and assistance—the Name of our Salvation, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Again and again we open the New Testament and

there these things are, clear, unmistakable, possessing the hearts, governing the lives of men like ourselves. And then we turn our eyes back upon life, our own lives and the lives of those about us, and we see how easily the very essence of all this is lost, and the worth of it let slip, not only where it is positively disbelieved and rejected, but where it is so loosely held as to lose all its real vitality, and to become so much honoured formula, expressing little more than this, that Christians have learned rather higher standards of conduct, rather clearer faith in God, by help of Jesus Christ.

Now there are two ways, as it seems to me plain, in which the God-given reality is most truly preserved. One I shall call the Spiritual, the other the Sacramental. From their mutual misunderstandings come a good half of our troubles. From their combination we have everything to hope. Briefly speaking, the one tends to evaporate faith into a sentiment; the other to stiffen grace into a machine.

But let me speak of both.

The first is the way of the faith which, resting itself upon the promise that He would be with us always, clasps fast the truth of this everliving nearness of Jesus. It remembers too, and lives upon, the promise of a gift of the Spirit Who should be the means by which He is near to us and we to Him, and it finds Jesus present through the presence of the Spirit by Whom alone comes strength into our weakness, and light into our darkness. It fortifies itself by all the marvellous and undeniable record of Christian experience. This is the faith which found a special outburst in Quakerism, and believed itself to possess (all else being refused and put away), the whole secret of Christianity. But in less naked or isolated forms, it has its long record, particularly in all that is summed up as Christian Mysticism, all the life of inward union and communion between the saved and the Saviour, between Jesus and His own.

In its presence, if we are humble and reverent, we bow our heads in awe of the goodness of God, and of the holiness which He has wrought in man. This is the fresh and flowing fountain which renews the very heart of the Church and of its members.

And yet alone, if I may be permitted this last stress on the principle which I have so often invoked, alone it droops and fails, or it melts and escapes, because it is not meant to be alone. Alone it is too ethereal, too purely internal; it is so individual and subjective in its witness that it is apt to become indistinguishable from our own states and emotion. It lacks substance, and regulation, and kinship with the texture of life.

But it is not meant to be alone. For the God-given thing of which I have spoken was not ashamed to be concrete. It stooped to be so. It took shape, first in one Life, at such a time, and such a place, in Jesus born of Mary, teaching in Galilee, dying on Calvary. It took shape, at once, afterwards in the company and flock and congregation and body of a Church of Jesus. Here was the very scene, and the very instrument of the work of the Spirit, giving severally to men their gifts, binding them up into a whole of common faith, common activity, mutual love. It took shape in things which formed parts and endowments and actions of this common life, in the Breaking of the Bread, with its utter simplicity and its profound spiritual meaning and efficacy, in the admission-act of cleansing, illumination, and incorporation by the washing, in the prescribed assembling of themselves together, in messages uttered by those whom the Spirit moved to speak, in the ministry of appointed men which Jesus Himself had sanctioned and begun when, so carefully, He chose and trained the Twelve. It is to all this that we give the name sacramental, because in all this the Spirit works through outward things, and the outward things become spiritual and talismans of power. And the thing which is vital

to it is that it is not of man but of God: not contrived by us as convenient, edifying or helpful (though it is all these), but put forth by the New Life that was given in Jesus, and embodied itself in these forms and acts. So it put itself into a shape which had consistency, and could be recognized, which helped men by acting upon them from without as well as within, which could travel, and yet make everywhere a home for souls. Between it and the spiritual or mystical there is antithesis but no opposition: they complement one another; they guard each other from their characteristic dangers.

And now, surely, we have before us all the tragedy of Christian history, the history of the Church, the fallings apart of things that should be at one, the hardening and misuse of forms, the contemptuous rejection of sacred things which were associated with their abuses, the cutting and carving and reshaping of them till they lose their character as Divine gifts and creations and seem to be human expedients, the setting up of Church against Church, when there can rightly be only one Church and Churches within it.

And in face of this tragedy where is the remedy, and what is the hope? Not certainly in any cleverness of ours, whether of statesmanship or philosophy. But in the work of the Spirit of God, who alone can work miracles, for it is miracles that we need, miracles in overcoming human prejudice, pride and selfishness, in breaking down barriers of separation, and moving mountains of difficulty, in turning enemies into allies, in teaching things that have fought one another to combine with one another.

This is the way of Christian unity, as we think of it, dream of it as ideal, pray for it that it may become real.

The prognostics indeed are dubious or sinister. The great Roman communion presents in this respect at present little to encourage hope, though she has behind her a twofold tradition, mystical and sacramental: and

though it is to a Roman Catholic, Baron von Hügel, that we owe the book of largest outlook, as it seems to me, upon the synthesis of the different elements of Christianity. But in this matter of unity Rome, as one of the two largest representatives of the Sacramental order, stiffens itself increasingly in its own ways.

And (passing by, as we too readily do, the vast mass of the Orthodox Church of the East where we miss the two essentials of movement, and of stimulating moral energy) there is for us Westerners not merely the welter and confusion of many denominations, but the suggestion, born of their number and confusion, that all forms are indifferent, and that sacraments are mere helps to imagination or sympathy. For thousands upon thousands of ordinary men who do not wish to be non-Christians, there is no real attachment and "belonging," no authority to which they look, no order of life sanctified by the experience of the saints, in which they may receive guidance, and nourishment, and comfort; and while the names of Christianity and revelation and redemption are still among us and exercising (thank God) not a little of their indirect and unchartered influence, the thing itself, the blessed thing of God's giving, which moves us to thankfulness, and fortifies our hope, and subdues us into humility, and converts us into gentleness, and strengthens us for self-restraint, has slipped through men's fingers and is lost.

It is perhaps better that I should not attempt to draw the morals which this review of the position suggests. The shaping of them for you and for me cannot be precisely the same. But I hope to have shown why I think that just that character of our religion is in most danger which is most profoundly vital and essential to it, viz.: its character as God's work through Christ in the world and in us: and that it is endangered partly at least by the fact that excess and misuse of hierarchical and sacramental claims have led by reaction to a fatal slight-

ing of things which were from the first part of God's revealed work, and which were meant to serve the purpose of giving permanence, and solidity, and reality, to what otherwise might vanish as a mere phase of human thought.

Therefore, I know for my own Church (and I hope it may be so, in somewhat different degree or form for yours), that our duty is to hold fast that part of our Catholic heritage, to maintain our emphasis on the Sacraments, on the Ordination of Ministers, and on the Episcopate, which is, at the least, the most effective symbol of the continuity as well as reality of the outward Order of Grace.

In so doing we must constantly remember, and our fellow Christians who are separated from us will help us to remember, the dangers which always beset the use of sacramental things and which in the past have led to men being repelled from them.

But I am convinced that we have at least as real a service to do for those who are of the other part, and who dread any stress upon visible things or outward order. For they know among themselves the real dangers of "down-grade," their foundation is unsecure, their younger men ask anxiously where they stand, while at times glimpses are seen of the most distressing uncertainty or even indifference about the central doctrine of the Gospel.

It is necessary in these matters to take long views, and to watch the slow work of tendencies. It is not enough to say that you can find today among the best Christians men who lay no stress on sacraments and on all that side of things. There have been few better men than the Friends, yet the Society of Friends is not, I imagine, in the same degree that it was, a "Church of the witness of the Holy Spirit." Much of the disintegration of faith today is explained when we realize the illegitimate and terrible stress put upon the unaided

power of individual faith to accept and affirm by its own naked strength what was meant to be the Spirit-taught witness of the whole body, to which each indeed is taught by the same Spirit to respond, "setting to his seal" that it is true, joining a genuine individual assent to a common voice which gives that assent courage and strength to speak.

It may be that God is drawing us towards unity by a common sense of need. It was when men fancied that essentials were secure that they had less scruple in falling apart. They did not realize how entirely the witness of the Truth claims all that we can diversely bring. We see this outwardly upon the great fields of work among our own industrial populations and among other races; and inwardly by observation of the effects of division in the lives that are divided.

But, we know or ought to know that the time is surely come or coming when we need one another, that we cannot dispense with one scrap or form of witness to the reality of the glorious Gospel, and the abiding Kingdom and (centre of it all) of Jesus with us. We are, or ought to be, increasingly conscious that the Spiritual and Sacramental need one another, were never meant to be anything but united, that if the Sacramental is nothing and worse than nothing without the Spirit, the Spiritual needs means, and the Holy Spirit has devised means, whereby to touch us, and to assure us of itself.

But it is in life and movement that we must learn these truths of life. Not by carefully devised balancing and equipoise, but by going forward to our tasks, marking, as we discharge or attempt them, each other's methods, gladly observant of each other's success, and more intensely conscious of mutual need, shall we move towards the unity which we seek.

The Gospel and the Modern Situation

By Gilbert Clive Binyon.

I

Turn which way we will in the religious world, we are beset by controversies. With reference to theology, to ecclesiastical matters and church life generally, to questions as to the relation between religion and the Social Problem—to name but three main groups of discussions—controversies are vigorously carried on. In each of these fields there are divers questions and varying answers; and problems started on one of these subjects merge themselves into problems more closely connected with another.

It would be easy to sweep all these controversies aside as the cobwebs spun by people who have nothing better to do; but Logic has her revenge, and such a rough and ready way will not do.

Certainly, however, it does seem that in many cases everything that can be said has been said, with little or no result.

When this point has been reached, do we not require that there be imported into the discussion a new element affording some single idea or principle around which arguments may be grouped?

Elements which, if not new in themselves, are comparatively new as elements in these discussions are not wanting. There are, conspicuously, two, which have an underlying unity with one another and afford an idea or principle such as we are in search of; these two are the

contact of Christendom and Western civilization with the rest of the world, and the Socialist movement; neither of them new, nor even new in relation to some of these controversies, yet new, perhaps, as having a bearing upon these controversies which might seem at first sight to have little or no connection with them. Both of them, however, have a bearing upon the whole of these discussions, and it is the purpose of this paper to consider that bearing. There is, it was remarked above, an underlying unity between them, and it is around this fundamental idea or principle thus discovered that a grouping of arguments in our controversies might, it is suggested, be effected.

This idea or principle is that of an organic relation between religion and the rest of life: and it is the demand for this organic relation between religion and the rest of life that is, in the end, the demand which the non-Christian world and the Socialist movement alike make upon the Church.

It was with great appropriateness that the author of a book on *Catholicism in China* headed a chapter about our "imported controversies", "From Confucius to Confusion." These imported controversies can have no real relation to the religious experiences of the Chinese, or for that matter of any non-Christians. And the dislike or suspicion amounting sometimes to hostility that is felt in some quarters towards Christian missions seems to spring from their association with a civilization which is alien to the thoughts and lives of people accustomed to a different mode of life. It is a religion in organic relation to their actual experiences and felt needs that they demand.

In its profoundest and most idealistic aspect, the Socialist movement is the endeavour after a civilization in harmony with man's personal life, in a word, the striving for a human and humane, in place of a brutal, civilization; and it is an organic relation between religion and this endeavour that Socialism demands.

All this would be, no doubt, platitudinous enough without some enquiry as to whether this demand is really after all justifiable in view of the nature of religion, and, further, as to what this organic relation between religion and the rest of life more precisely is or should be. These points will now be considered.

II

It is significant that of the Christian Bible the greater part consists of the Old Testament—a fact indicating that there are certain presuppositions of Christianity which find their fullest and clearest, if not indeed their only, expression in the Religion of Israel.

The Messianism of Israel, though not without certain parallels elsewhere, was, really, unique; for nowhere else has full weight been given to all those three factors which —according to a favourite idea of the late Bishop Westcott —are necessary in religion, those three factors being the individual soul, its relation to God, and its relation to the world. Leave out any one of these, and you may have some sort of religion, but one which can not in the nature of things permanently satisfy; and it is the full and due emphasis upon each of those factors, that is the first presupposition of Christianity.

There may indeed be a Messianism of a sort which leaves out one of these factors in religion, and from it the approach to Christianity may be made; so that, in one sense, this balance of emphasis is not, no doubt, an absolute prerequisite; but it must be introduced with Christianity unless the latter is to become distorted, and, historically, as one, and perhaps the chief, distinguishing characteristic of the Religion of Israel, it seems to have been part of the appointed preparation for the Gospel.

There is also another presupposition of Christianity—a certain disillusionment with this Messianism, not, not in the least, an abandonment of it, but, partly, a sense of disappointment at the delay and a weariness of hope just

not amounting to hopelessness, and, partly, a sense of the unsatisfying nature of the finite, a sense that however much human affairs are brought under the dominion of morality and religion, man still hungers for the Infinite and the Transcendent, still thirsts after God. Here again the qualification must be made that this is a presupposition historically and apparently normally, but not, as a matter of fact, an universally necessary prerequisite.

It is plain that the religion of the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel was organically related to the rest of life: everything bears witness to this: their utterances, from Moses to Daniel, bear the impress of the times and circumstances in which they lived; they looked for and yearned for a deliverance from sin and evil, for the Messianic Age.

It was, primarily, to those whose hearts were sick or impatient and restless with the long-deferred hope and who yet could not abandon that hope, that the Gospel was preached: to them alone, it would seem indeed, was the Gospel Good News. These were the poor, or poor in spirit, to whom the Gospel was preached.

Interpret the Gospel how we will, there follows upon our acceptance of it, if our Christianity is substantially true to New Testament type, a new kind of life, eternal life, which (to borrow an illuminating phrase) "quickens while it satisfies aspiration." There is a satisfying of aspiration, and at the same time a quickening of it. The Messianic aspiration is satisfied, because, in Christ, Transcendence and Infinity and the Perfection of Humanity are found, concentrated and incarnate in flesh and blood in an adorable Person; but this satisfaction of Messianism is not such that the aspiration is abolished as having served its preparatory purpose; it is also at the same time and by the very satisfaction which it finds thereby quickened; for in Christ is also found an infinity of energy, a love for mankind which agonizes until His own Perfection is bestowed upon and manifested in

Humanity. Hope is transformed from a repeatedly disappointed expectation into confidence, and becomes an attribute—the dynamic quality—of faith.

Such seems to be the relation of the Gospel to the Messianic Hope which preceded it—a double fulfilment by the satisfaction of aspiration and the quickening of endeavour, both parts of the fulfilment being organically related to the whole personal life, to the hopes and fears and distresses and yearnings which constitute the total reaction of the whole personality to the whole of environment, to the times and circumstances in which the individual lives.

III

Before going any further it will be worth while to notice what appear to be incomplete forms of Christianity, originating from a neglect or partial neglect of the Old Testament background, of the presuppositions of the Gospel.

The Atonement, for example, has been preached where there has been no sense of a disappointed Messianism due to human sin, but only a sense of personal and individual sin, and even sometimes where this, too, has been wanting.

In an article in *The East and The West* an experienced missionary not long ago stated that, no matter what is preached, the convert gets hold of a gospel of his own which might be thus expressed: "There is one God, and Jesus is His Prophet." Similarly, at home there is a form of Christianity which might be described as the Gospel of the Kingdom preached by Jesus the Champion of the oppressed. In both these cases, the fulness of the Gospel Message has, for one reason or another, not been apprehended; the religious instinct has seized upon and appropriated as a Gospel what is, it must be said, but little more than the Law and the Prophets, the presupposition of the Gospel.

These and all other forms of Christianity might be

grouped by means of the idea of the satisfaction and the quickening of aspiration. These two elements, detachment and love, apparently contradictory, are in reality complementary; and where one is developed at the expense of the other our religion tends, in varying degrees and extents, to fall away from the fulness of the Gospel and to approximate either to some kind of Eastern tranquillity or to a sort of reformed non-legal Judaism.

IV

The nature of peoples' aspirations which were both satisfied and quickened by the Gospel at the beginning of the Christian Era can be discovered, with more or less precision, by a study of the records.

The question is, however, raised whether circumstances are at all the same now as then, whether the moral, social and religious conditions of our own day are at all equivalent to those of New Testament times.

There is one point in which the two periods are certainly dissimilar. In New Testament times no Parliaments opened proceedings with prayers in the name of Christ: no Courts of Justice sat in the presence of a crucifix: no Imperial officials thought that it was in Christ's name that they were administering the Roman Empire: no one looked upon Government and commerce and civilization generally as being Christian in origin. In a word, Christianity was something new, and the world of civilization, which contained some elements antagonistic to Christianity and others less so or even perhaps in harmony with it, was, as a whole, independent of a Christian origin.

The New Testament was written both by and for people who lived under a government and administration which made no sort of profession or claim to be in any sense or degree Christian. Today—with what justification is another matter—we speak of the Christian nations, a Christian government, Christian civilization, and so on; we assume, that is, that where Christianity is the pro-

fessed religion of the great bulk of the population in any country, there government and administration and indeed civilization generally should be Christian. This last is a statement which needs some qualification; and something further will be said on the point; but even those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics and economics go so far at any rate as to say that they live in a Christian country. Now the writers and readers of the New Testament may, or may not, have looked forward to a time when civilization would be permeated by Christianity, but anyhow they certainly did not believe that that time had already arrived; the whole of what is said in the New Testament as to peoples' social obligations, their relation to the State, the duty of almsgiving and so on, being written by and for people living under a non-Christian régime does not give and cannot be expected to give explicit and formal directions for behaviour under conditions which are not similar in that now the State and all civilization, even if not supposed to be Christian, is at any rate criticized in the light of principles borrowed from or harmonious with Christianity. This criticism is made, not only by people who are themselves Christians but also by people who refuse to be Christians on the very ground that the civilization which they criticize is of Christian origin. In connection both with missions and with the social problem at home this idea that government, industry and civilization as a whole, either is, or should now be, Christian, constitutes a main difference between the condition of the present day and New Testament times.

The whole situation is extraordinarily intricate and confused; but it is maintained here that this criticism of civilization as it is, is the chief element in the underlying unity between the demands made upon the Church by the Socialist movement and that quality of mind with which missionaries come in contact, which expresses itself sometimes as a part of racial feeling, sometimes as a desire for independence, sometimes as a hatred of civilization,

sometimes as an opposition to Christianity; in both cases (as I am trying to say) the demand is at bottom the demand for an unity in the several elements in life, and, so far as we are specially concerned here, for an organic relation between religion and the rest of life.

This demand, whether it appears among Christians opposed to a civilization they consider antagonistic to Christianity or among non-Christians who agree with this opposition and perhaps include within its scope Christianity itself or at any rate the Church, may be regarded as the equivalent of the Messianism of our Lord's day which He came not to destroy but to fulfil; it is the aspiration which the Gospel should both quicken and satisfy.

V

In the light of this idea, let us return to the controversies with which we started; let us try to discover whether this idea or principle does afford us any help.

The first thing we notice, preliminarily, is that in all these controversies whether on theology or on ecclesiastical questions or on the relation of religion through morality to civilization, in every case there has been introduced something like a cross-division. I say "something like" a cross-division because everywhere it is a division of opinions, of ideas and thoughts, of principles and sorts of action that we encounter—a division which has but little actual relation to any division or grouping of human minds whether as individuals, schools of thought, religious denominations, economic classes, nations, or races. The ideas which are theoretically, ideally one might almost say, characteristic of one of these groups may be found in individuals who belong, actually, to a different group; there are Tory working men, Kafir Imperialists, commercialized Indians, Indian-minded Englishmen, and so on. There is, as someone has said, "a separation of opinions rather than of persons."

Speaking, then, not of individuals or groups but of

opinions, ideas, and principles of action, we do discover a cross-division; classification by the principle of an organic relation between religion and the rest of life ignores, or at any rate is not coincident with, the classifications into Catholic or Protestant, High Church or Low Church, Eastern or Western, "civilized" or "native," European or Asiatic, upper-class or working-class, and so on.

We discover, next, that some of the controversies have lost their former interest and have acquired a different one.

Suppose, for example, that the question is about the Resurrection of our Lord as a fact in history. We shall take our stand upon some such passage as that in which St. Peter says that God "hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"; or that in which the same Apostle says that God raised Christ from the dead "and gave Him glory that our faith and hope might be in God." If people have this living hope and this faith, it is a minor matter, we shall feel, what they may believe about the Resurrection as an event in history; though at the same time we may be thoroughly convinced that apart from a belief in the Resurrection there is no valid ground for faith and hope. In short, we shall be concerned to maintain, assert, develop, and spread our conviction of the historical nature of the Resurrection because in that Fact we find the only sure ground for that faith in God and that living hope whereby our aspirations are both satisfied and quickened. Apart from this connection with our religious aspirations, the documentary evidence may be argued about to and fro for ever.

Or suppose it is Prayer Book Revision that is being discussed: we shall find that it is not only the usual points that have an importance but that there are others, usually disregarded, which are equally, and compared with some proposed alterations far more, important. One instance would be the section of the Prayer for the Church Militant which reads: "We beseech thee also to save and defend

all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors: and specially thy servant George our King: that under him we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole Council, and to all that are put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice and to the maintenance of thy true religion, and virtue." This is all quite unsatisfactory. Why all *Christian* Kings, Princes, and Governors? Are Mohammedan potentates, the President of the Chinese Republic, the Emperor of Japan, and other non-Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors inaccessible to divine grace that we should not remember them in our prayers? Again, surely it is now time that it were recognized in the Prayer Book that in our own country it is the Cabinet and Parliament rather than the King "under whom" we are governed, especially as the Prayer Book abounds elsewhere in references to the monarchy. The allusion to Parliament, as the King's "whole Council," has an antiquated air about it, and, if Cabinet and Parliament were substituted or included in the first sentence, might well be replaced by a mention of the permanent officials. More important, probably, than all these points is the reference which follows to "justice," which seems to be here understood exclusively as legal retributive justice, and not at all as distributive social justice; in the Prayer Book phrasing is perpetuated the idea that the sole function of the State is the maintenance of law and order, whereas this function is becoming increasingly overshadowed by the administrative function both of the central Government and of those other bodies, such as County and Borough Councils, Town and Urban or Rural District Councils, which are "put in authority."

The mention of this function of the State leads us to the subject of parochial activities. In almost every parish there is one or more organization for some purpose or other. Following our idea of the organic relation between religion and the rest of life, we shall naturally look to these

organizations to train up a succession of men and women qualified, spiritually and mentally, to take their places, whether as officials or otherwise, in a community organized for serving the general welfare. On this view of national service, the opposition to militarism is based fundamentally on its diversion of attention from the prophetic ethic—the general welfare—either to a patriotism which identifies capitalist interests with national interests or to a patriotism which consists in the sentiment of domination or to the apprehension of dangers due to these perverted patriotisms; and it is the redirection of attention, the substitution of Christian patriotism, which is a part and an aspect of the love of one's neighbour, and the development of a spirit of self-sacrifice for social purposes, for the welfare of the whole world-population, that is, we shall feel, the part which the Church, through parochial organizations and by other means, has to play in connection with the State.

VI

It remains, finally, to consider whether the demand for an organic relation between religion and the rest of life may be expected to make any contribution to the body of Christian thought.

That such contributions are received by the Church from time to time is an idea which has now a general acceptance, and is frequently met with in missionary literature. Such contributions appear always, or possibly one should say usually, to take place, not so much by the introduction of really new elements as by a re-emphasizing of beliefs or ideas or aspects of truth which had always been recognized in the Church but had for one reason or another fallen into the background.

I think that whether we discuss theology, or ecclesiastical matters, or the connection between religion, morality and civilization, we shall find the most hopeful course to consist in the reaffirmation of certain doctrines which

either are to be found in Holy Scripture or may be proved thereby.

First, then, as to some of our theological questions.

There seems to be a necessity—I at least used to feel this necessity—of bringing together so as to form one conception or different parts of one conception the belief in the Presence of Christ in the hearts of His faithful people, in the sacrament of Holy Communion, and in the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the naked, the sick, and the prisoner. The first two are, of course, commonly thought of in conjunction with one another; but the Presence of Christ in the poor and suffering is most frequently believed in as a fact which has no real connection with the sacramental presence or that in the heart through faith. It will perhaps make my meaning clearer if I quote the following human document in which the point is unconsciously raised. It describes the experience of Mrs. Bruce Glasier.

"I was kneeling," she wrote once in the *Labour Leader*, "in All Saints' Church, Clifton, then one of the richest ritualistic churches in the land, on All Saints' Sunday. . . . At the critical moment of the High Celebration, with every corner of the church decorated with flowers, with the incense breathing upwards and the choir boys' marvellous singing hailing the Presence—in they came, the fourth part of 3,000 cotton lassies out on strike against starvation wages. The church was crowded with a fashionable congregation. There was no room for these—strangers—save in the empty space between the altar rails and the kneeling, worshipping throng. Fasting, with all the passionate emotion of my nature at its highest, I had been praying for a fuller consciousness of the Presence, and there they stood, 750 sister-women, if the 'Our Father' were true, ill-clad, wet through with the driving rain, hungry. It was the eleventh week of the strike, with no Trade Union pay. 'They stand between me and the Christ.' So the thought smote me, so I see it still. Never shall any human being, so long as the world suffers wrong, know one moment's real communion with the mind of the Master till they have actively thrown in their lot with the poor and the oppressed."

The idea that in the Holy Communion we receive Christ not only as He is in His ascended glory but also as He suffers and agonizes in the poor and oppressed; that the motive which impelled the cotton lassies to strike

against starvation wages was a working of the Energy of Christ's Passion on behalf of our emancipation from sin; that His Sacrifice with which we, sacramentally, are united, gathered in itself all devoted and self-sacrificing efforts to raise mankind Godward, and through this its inclusive character was full perfect and sufficient and thus the Divine and satisfying Answer to all our long-drawn hopes:—these ideas, demanded for the quickening and satisfying of our aspirations, themselves demand, in the realm of theology, a re-emphasizing of the doctrine of the inclusive, universal, impersonal Humanity of Christ. Apart from this doctrine those who are under the necessity of thinking out their beliefs find or are liable to find that religious devotion and the service of the poor and the oppressed are, though not alternatives, yet without organic relationship with one another.

It may be remarked here, in passing, that this doctrine and the idea which flows from it that we are "in Christ" irrespective of our spiritual and moral condition, that there is an indwelling of Christ in mankind by nature as well as by grace,—that this belief makes comprehensible the suggestion which would otherwise be unintelligible that at some future date, not now, of course, but some time in the future, the method of preachers of the Word to non-Christians will be not so much that of a mission as of the unification of religion. (This phrase is borrowed, of course, from Father Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads.*) The task, according to this suggestion, would be so to condition the growth of religious life as to be true to its Original. However this may be, there are few more comforting doctrines than the one which thus finds expression in William Law's *Spirit of Prayer:*

"If thou wouldst still further know, how this great Work, the *Birth* of Christ, is to be effected in thee, then let this joyful Truth be told thee, that this great Work is *already* begun in every one of us. For this Holy Jesus, that is to be formed in thee, that is to be the Saviour and new Life of thy Soul, that is to raise thee out of the Darkness of Death into the Light of Life, and give thee Power

to become a Son of God, is already *within* thee, living, stirring, calling, knocking at the Door of thy Heart, and wanting nothing but thy own *Faith* and *good Will*, to have as real a Birth and Form in thee, as He had in the Virgin *Mary*."

Or in Erskine of Linlathen's *Brazen Serpent:*

"If a man does not hope in Christ, how can Christ be in him as the hope of glory? . . . Christ is in our decayed fallen family the hope of glory, though little appreciated, and He is in each one of the family, though unknown and unnoticed. Yes, reader, Christ is in you, the hope of glory, and you shall be presented holy and unblamable and unreprovable in the sight of the Father, if you continue in this *faith*, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from this *hope* of the gospel which ye have heard."

This whole way of thinking seems, no doubt, to many minds deplorably vague: once we start on these lines, it may be urged, what security have we that it will really be "into Christ in all things" that people will "grow up" spiritually and morally? What guarantee have we of any continuity in faith and practice?

We are thus led to our second group of controversies, about the authority of creeds, the necessity and nature of sacraments, about Church organization generally, and kindred subjects.

It is here, especially, that a point of exhaustion seems almost to have been arrived at; the arguments prove no more convincing after repetition than they did before. It is true that there is a better mutual understanding between different groups than there was once; and this is in itself a gain; but it does seem that what is required is that institutions (if the word may be stretched for once to cover all that is here referred to) should be explained in the light of their value in answering the demand of which we are speaking.

Creed-formulas, church organization, Sacraments,—all these may be interpreted as being pledges of, and means of securing, continuity, solidarity, unity through sacrifice, the very things, in fact, which are most valued in the quarters to which we refer. Such a demonstration of their value would be, for those who already hold to them,

their vindication, while to those who do not do so, it would be their justification.

Such a vindication or justification might be—perhaps is—an incidental result, a by-product, of the Fellowship of Followers, a Fellowship in connection with Browning Settlement at Walworth, open to Christians of all denominations, kept together by this social orientation of religion. The same applies to a Social Service Society connected with a missionary college abroad, a society which is open not only to Christians but also to Mohammedans and Buddhists. With reference to the former of these two, "an eminent theologian in one of the more highly organized Churches, hearing of the Fellowship, expressed the belief that it was probably in some such form the reunion of Christendom would begin." But I am afraid that no such result will happen unless, concurrently with co-operation in practical matters, the necessity for the vindication or justification mentioned above is fairly faced; unless this is done, must there not be a tendency to disruption, some saying that all this social service is good but religion must be first, others throwing overboard the Christian traditions and lapsing into the position of the I.L.P. man who said, "I don't care whether your theology is that of the Roman Church, or that of the Anglican Church, or that of the Free Churches, so long as you believe in the Brotherhood of Man and the Sisterhood of Woman." This comment may also be made upon the idea that the Church Socialist League may unite varying schools of thought within the Anglican communion. It is not a question of high Church or low Church or broad Church interpretation of, say, the sacraments; but it is a question of their interpretation in the light of the demand for an organic relation between religion and the rest of life. All this, it is here claimed, —I need not add,—is in accordance with that view which is to be found in Holy Scripture.

From theology we have been led, by way of the notion

of continuity, to Church questions and the reunion of Christendom. From this we go on, by a natural transition, to our third group of controversies, as to the relation of religion through morality to politics and economics.

On this subject, there is the utmost diversity of opinion; some say that religion can flourish equally well under any social system, and can be practiced alike by rich and poor; others think both superfluity of riches and destitution to be hindrances in the way of religion; some think that a betterment of conditions would make it easier to be moral and religious, while others think that this would sap the springs of moral effort; some like to think of the moral rich and the vicious poor, others of the wicked rich and their innocent victims; some dwell on our Christian civilization, contrasting it with that of the non-Christian world, while others, denying the Christian nature of our society, assert that Christian morality demands a wholesale reconstruction of economic arrangements. And so on.

We shall, I think, gain much help from the doctrine that systems or methods of organizing government and industry and social life generally are to be criticized on moral grounds without reference to the moral and spiritual condition of the individual persons who administer these systems; and that it is a matter of concern to the Christian that the principles upon which these systems are based are in accordance with the principles of Christianity.

Once this doctrine is admitted, it will be seen how entirely irrelevant it is to introduce the question of character when the merits of rival systems are being discussed. There is a constant tendency to assume that the plan one likes will be efficiently carried out and that the plan one does not like will be bungled: yet this unfair assumption is continually made: for fair discussion, it should be assumed that the rival systems will be worked equally well, or, if you like, equally badly, but anyhow

with the same amount, great or small, of efficiency and conscientiousness.

It will probably be denied by some that the nature of systems of government or industry is in itself of any concern to the Christian; and it is true that we only arrive at a criticism of them by the effects, observed or inferred, upon individuals; nevertheless, the influence exerted upon the life of the individual by these systems, especially those of industry, is in any case so large, and in our own highly complex social order so enormous, that a religion which has no concern for these systems is out of organic relation to the rest of life.

If the demand for this relation with the rest of life is justified, as I have tried to show above, then this doctrine just stated has to be adopted.

Whether or not this doctrine is to be found in Holy Scripture, it may, I think, be proved thereby.

It was only in the face of opposition from the prophets of Israel that civilization established itself at all among the Chosen People. In the genealogy given in the fourth chapter of Genesis, the first building of a city, and the origin of the arts of civilization, are attributed to the descendants of the Cain who slew his brother, who asked whether he were his brother's keeper, who went forth from the presence of God. Here and elsewhere in the Old Testament, the attitude of the prophets and the prophetic historians seems to have been "God made the country, man made the town"; urbanization, division of labour, and commercial enterprise were seen to militate against that humane spirit of solidarity which it was the original function of the Law not less than of the Prophets to maintain; those things were contrary to that ideal of civilization which describes it as "the visibility of the spirit"; it would be better to have no civilization at all than a godless one.

All this is, of course, only to say more philosophically and in a fashion more fit for the ears of the polite what

the Prophets meant when they denounced the landlords and the idle rich. It is by Divine providence that mankind is dependent upon the earth for the means of life; and a civilization which diverted production into the service of the few could not, according to the prophets, be right and just. The prophetic idea of righteousness is here strictly parallel to the Socialist ideal—I do not say the Socialist economic proposal—which is expressed in the formula, Production for use and not for profit.

The New Testament language about the Kingdom, the New Jerusalem, and the analogies of the Temple and of the Body, not to mention the allegory of the Vine and the Branches, at least suggest that the scope of the Divine Purpose includes not only individuals but persons as organized corporately. Combining this suggestion—which might well be thought to be more than a suggestion—with the Old Testament idea of civilization, we are led to one of two conclusions,—civilization must be abandoned, or must be transformed in accordance with Christian principles.

On the first alternative, all is plain sailing; we settle down to the Simple Life, and carry out literally the Sermon on the Mount.

But those of us who cannot believe that the communication between the races of the earth that mechanical invention has made possible, the knowledge of the world we live in that the telescope and the microscope and all the resources of science have opened up to us, and the applications of this knowledge that have been made, man's conquests over diseases, the triumphs of medicine and surgery,—those of us who can not believe that all this has been wholly without God's guidance, wholly apart from and even contrary to revelation, must take a different line; we must say that civilization is to be Christianized; we must assert the doctrine that the institutions of civilization are in themselves, as distinct

from the persons who work them, to be based on Christian principles; we must apply this doctrine in the light of that prophetic conception of righteousness, of the primacy of justice, which lies at the back of our Lord's teaching.

Such explicit and formal directions as to definite social duties as are given us in the Gospels and Epistles are given, as remarked above, on the assumption that the State is independent of Christianity.

Thus it comes about that, to quote from an article in *The Church Socialist* by the Rev. P. E. T. Widdrington, "the Church can never transform a complex society like our own so long as it continues to dispense teaching which implies that we are living under conditions similar to those of New Testament times." It would seem that as the State or the institutions of civilization gradually come to be dominated by Christian principles, so these explicit directions come to lose their application and are to be obeyed not in the letter but in the spirit.

I have not been able to discover with absolute clearness what it is that Prof. Schweitzer considers to have been the *Interimsethik* or how it differs from the ethics of the Law and the Prophets; anyhow, it is even less applicable to a complex society than the latter. The point here is, however, that the general idea thus suggested of a distinction between the behaviour appropriate before the coming of the Kingdom and the ethics or activities of the Kingdom itself is one which may give us valuable help. (I am assuming, of course, that we translate the apocalyptic vision into the idea of successive crises by which the Church and the world are advancing towards the ideal of the Kingdom.) On these lines, as the Church leavens the world, in other words as secular institutions come bit by bit under the dominion of Christian principles, potentially or actually, the commands laid upon us by our Lord and His Apostles are to

be obeyed by us not, or not only, as individuals, but collectively through the machinery which the State or other organization provides.

An example may be found in the case of the commands about almsgiving. In a primitive community where there is no great network of economic interdependence, or in a society however complex where Christian principles are not supposed to have any force at all, almsgiving by and to individuals may be the best thing; but the object of almsgiving is, surely, the supplying of the poor man's needs, and where there is a complex society with far-reaching economic interrelations, a system, that is, which creates riches and poverty, and where also there is a sufficient body of Christian public opinion, this individual almsgiving has become quite inappropriate; what is required is that all occasion for the asking of alms should be removed. Individual "charity" is all very well as the ethic of the interim; the Kingdom demands the abolition of poverty.

The doctrine that institutions, systems of industry and so on, are themselves to be Christianized is only, it is claimed, an adaptation to the conditions under which we live of the prophetic and evangelical doctrine of righteousness, of the primacy of justice. On this point, the following paragraph from an address by the Rev. N. E. Egerton Swann brings out very clearly what should be our scale of values:

"The Bible . . . certainly does convey very strongly the general impression that the rich as such are in a morally false position. It seems to require that they shall renounce, and repent of, the accepted point of view of their class. They must, as it were, apologize for their position, and be sincerely and intensely anxious to find a way out of the whole moral tangle of riches and poverty. Certainly they must be perfectly ready to surrender gladly their position, if any scheme for establishing a juster and more equal society can be found. The Church in fact cannot really accept them *as* rich people at all. She cannot allow them to go on supposing that it is perfectly right and proper that they should be rich. . . . The accepted ideas on this subject are wholly and utterly wrong: a complete revolution in the point of view is called for."

VII

The authority of Christ springs from the fact that it is the Gospel which alone fulfils the Messianic aspirations of mankind. To preach Christianity as authoritative without reference to the needs of the human heart, or to adapt Christianity to the wishes (I do not say the real needs) of possible converts, are alike disastrous. But if that alienation from the Church which is too frequent both among Socialists at home and national patriots abroad really does arise from the demand for an organic unity between religion and the rest of life, then here we find a principle which seems not only to throw some light on the controversies with which we are beset but also to indicate a way whereby peoples' highest aspirations may be fulfilled and the continuity of the Christian Faith preserved.

Theocentric Theology:

In Peace and In War

By Professor Dr. Erich Schäder,
University of Kiel.

A new and characteristic tendency in German Protestant theology has been making itself felt for some years. Men are seeking to bring the fact of the living God more strongly, more centrally, to bear in theology and in the practical life of faith than was the case in the main forms of theology during the nineteenth century. The so-called theocentric theology, then, does not present itself without more or less energetic criticism of previous dogmatics. In this it is moved alike by interests of religion and of method which are, of course, inseparable. The present religious and ecclesiastical situation in Germany is undoubtedly precisely ripe for the reception of such a theological orientation. But this condition extends far beyond the German frontiers. Great political events, struggles involving the destiny of whole States and of powerful spheres of culture are drawing the eyes of men with unexampled power to the majesty of the eternal, supra-natural God, who guides the history of nations and gives to it through the atonement in Christ new powers of conquest. Once more the great living God comes to be the central point of thought, desire, aspiration. He then must come to be the central point of theology. This, too, must become theocentric.

Now it cannot be denied that the catch phrase "theocentric theology" involves the danger of a misapprehension. It might seem as though this theology, avoiding humanity, human faith, and human experience of faith,

were seeking, with an imagined objectivity, to take its stand immediately with God, and from that point were seeking to exhibit God's binding and loosing power. If that were indeed its purpose, it would be undertaking the absolutely impossible, as Protestant theology since Luther, and again since Schleiermacher, has perceived with penetrating clarity. It would, then, like Icarus, seek to scale heaven only to fall to earth again. No, the fact remains that God will never be known or comprehended without man; never, that is, by starting only from one's own personality. The way to God leads only through our faith. So far all normal theology is necessarily subjective, as Ihmels has recently been unwearied in emphasizing. People speak generally nowadays in religious and theological circles of the experience of God which a man must have had in order to stand in any real personal relation to God and to make any true declaration about the reality of God. That catch phrase "religious experience" (*Erlebniss oder Erleben*) is, to be sure, not without its danger. It may so mislead that there gets into Christianity an untenable religious individualism which destroys all real unity and universality in the faith, or destroys the Church in her true evangelical nature. But the misuse of the term does not take away its justification. Without experience of God there is neither faith nor theology; that is, there is no theology without the human medium. We can approach God only through our faith. Till Kant's day men thought that we could attain to God through speculative reasonings, starting from the world or mankind. That conception is false, for it too started with man. A topsy-turvy theology defends the idea today that all the truth that it concerns us to know in regard to the living God can just be read off by us out of the inspired canon of Holy Scripture. But even those as wrong-headed as this must believe that one can read divine truth out of the Bible only when one believes in the Bible. In short,

there is no getting on without man and his faith. Theology is a matter of faith. Since this is so, we may say that all real theology is anthropocentric in method. It has its point of departure in man, with his faith or with his faith's experience of God. This fact the theocentric theology seeks in no way to controvert. Some have tried to foist such preposterousness on it, but it is quite free of any such thing.

What is its purpose, then? What special aims does its name express?

It starts with the conviction that in faith God takes the absolute governing, central position. In the true, genuine faith, man is not dominant, but the living God. This is as true of the origin as of the content or of the end of faith. Our faith comes wholly from God, is wholly the sovereign product of the majesty of God. The determining content of our faith, the goal that controls its course, lies not in this, that we have God on our side, but that we, through all the grace of God who lives in Christ for us, are here for God's sake; for His service, His honour, we are, in our faith, wholly subdued under the rule of God. In it we circle around God as our centre. God does not, as it were, circle around us, as encompassing His own. This normal condition theocentric theology wishes to assert and to express in all its relations. So it is guided by a very characteristic thought of God and a very clearly defined conception of faith.

From this fundamental relation there follows for theocentric theology a series of definite antitheses to influential forms or methods of recent dogmatics. It must first by criticism clear the ground on which it is to stand.

We have, first, to consider the theology of the so-called Erlangen school. Its chief representatives were Von Hofmann and Frank. This school has largely lost importance in Germany, but the circle of its adherents is still considerable. Hofmann and Frank sought to

attain the reality of the living God and of Christ, with all the religious truth that this reality includes, in this way: They began with the Christian, with his faith, or rather, with his new condition of life, and from this, reasoning backward with logical inferences, they gained hold on the cause of this faith, namely, God and Christ. Both theologians in this matter were allied to Schleiermacher, only that Schleiermacher in his Christian dogmatics enters on still other paths of theological deliberation. The Erlangen method, for a time, made a very great impression. People thought that they had mastered for ever the question about God and the one about Christ, especially the second. So soon as the new or regenerate Christian life existed in anyone, they thought one could lead him by irrefutable logical inference to God and to the Christ of history as to the real foundation of that life. In fact, this method implies a great self-deception. Starting from man with his faith, one could by logical inference attain the reality of God only if some natural relation existed between God and personal faith; that is, if God and faith were connected by bonds of necessity. Starting from a chemical product, one can determine with certainty the factors that produce it. But faith, where it is at all, is the free-personal, sovereign working of the living God, and before Him all compulsion by an analytic logical operation is done away. Besides even if this perverse anthropocentric method were justified, one could never attain the whole, complete God in that way. God is Lord of heaven and earth, the supra-mundane Majesty. If one has not this fundamental element of the divine Being, one has not God. But from man, with his faith or his new life as a starting-point, one could prove only a God who had might and power over the human soul,—nothing more. One would get in following this line of reasoning only a diminished God, that would fall short of the height of His revelation.

But protest against the mistaken anthropocentrism of Erlangen theology is of less importance than protest against a further development of modern theology. Ritschl sought to establish a consistent theology of values; that is, God in his system is conceived throughout from the point of view that He is a "value" for us, indeed, the most utter value. In this theology we men are throughout the purpose of God. God exists for us. He does not appear as the purpose for which we men, or creatures, exist. This fundamental point of view has gained a deep-seated significance for modern piety. The widest circles speak of the love of God. When was the love of God ever talked or preached about so much as in Ritschl's theological following? But while they do this, they have, so to speak, God "among themselves," not, as befits the Majesty of God, above themselves. They see in God, as the controlling element, the means to their own human end,—for lifting us above the course of nature, for securing us against its shock, or for the fulfilment and exaltation of our personality. Our personal life lifts itself above God. In the name of His love, or the significance of His "value" (*Wertbedeutung*) for us, God is degraded. Hence comes a lack of humility, of godly fear, of piety, which is really startling, in the religious and ecclesiastical life of very recent times. With nothing do many modern men think to settle their accounts so lightly and so quickly as with the living God and His Christ. He exists for them, it seems, for their end. It is interesting to note in what measure this conception has also influenced the work on the philosophy of religion. For many of its representatives it is actually a dogma that in all religion we have to do in principle with the securing of human life or the uplifting of it through connection with divinity. The conception of religion thus becomes wholly anthropocentric or ego-centric. And in the history of mankind, as they see it, the development of religion is that gradually the sense for the uplifting of human life becomes ever less ma-

terial, outward, but more moral or spiritual, while with this the conception of God rises higher. A book like that of William James on *Varieties of Religious Experience* is wholly dominated by this fundamental conviction. Theocentric theology seeks to do away with this error. It aims to free God and religion from the grip of the category, What is its value? It seeks to aid the appreciation in faith of the majesty, the domination of God, or of our "For God." And in doing this it seeks among other things to make a stand against the destructive criticism which L. Feuerbach and his adherents have applied to the whole religious life. Feuerbach is convinced that all religion is concerned in fortifying human life by aid of the thought of God. Man needs God, therefore he forms the conception of God. Religion then, in all its forms, becomes a delusion and fantasy. So we are striving for the authenticity of religion when we reject the so-called "theology of valuations." Only a theocentric theology can succeed in eliminating doubt in the truth of faith. Of course, such a theology does not fail to perceive that God, who desires us unconditionally for Himself and His rule, has at the same time in His grace or in His love, the significance of a "value," indeed, of the highest value for us. But this fact does not outweigh the other, that, fundamentally, God is our Lord who as such places us in His service. Therefore, fundamentally, faith is a surrender to God, obedience to God, and fear of God. Whoever knows the history of Protestant Christianity, knows how slight the activity of broad Christian circles has often been. They rested in faith; they sought peace and comfort for their souls. Really they sought no more. Of a living energy of work for God and for His Kingdom, there was not a word. The work for human progress was stirring and developing in a thousand ways, but the work of the Church, the work of faith, was small. So the Church, in the judgment of men, was relegated to the rearguard. They attributed

to her no importance for public life in state and in society. Theocentric theology seeks to put a barrier to this mischief. It seeks to put away pure quietism of faith; it seeks to stir to new life the impulses of faith to activity, to the conquest of the world for God, and for His sake. Here appears clearly how little this is a mere matter of a theological school. It has, together with all due appreciation of reflection, a pronounced practical character.

But theocentric theology bestirs itself also to other contradictions than those of which we have yet spoken. We must consider two further theological or dogmatic tendencies in which it finds subject of criticism.

There is a kind of theology in Germany that one may describe as "conscience-theology." Its chief exponents were the two notable Biblical scholars, Cremer and Kaehler. Both were convinced that the decisive contents of Holy Scripture would approve itself to the human conscience, and that the task of dogmatics was to exhibit this contents for which our conscience would bear witness. So they pushed man, with his conscience, into the centre of their investigations. The theology which came into existence in this way was, to put it briefly, a theology of "sin and grace," or of the conviction of sin and the certainty of salvation. They proved from conscience that the holy God, because of man's sins, found him guilty or condemned him, and they joined with this the doctrine of the grace of God in Christ, which exculpates or atones the sin. In recent times Kaehler especially is the declared theologue of justification. None will deny that this conscience-theology has had great positive significance for the life of faith in Germany and other Protestant lands, and that it still has. It has strongly accentuated the seriousness of sin, the greatness of the divine holiness, and the unconditionality of the grace of God. Thus it has deepened the life of faith and given a mighty impulse to the

propaganda of faith or to the world mission. But it is wholly soteriological, it reflects only on the lost estate of men, and their rescue. And in so far it is too narrow. God has not only to do with the human soul. The theme: "God and the soul" does not express all with which theology has to do. God is the Lord of the *world*. He has also the course of nature in His hand. This conscience-theology is averse to nature; it is one-sided spiritualistically. But in our day it is peculiarly desirable to secure for men the conviction that the living God meets them not only in the inner chamber of their souls, but also in the activities of nature and its course. This is so important because for many modern men the belief in the reality of God vanishes just at nature, at what they call the scientific conception of nature. We must build up again a natural theology, one, of course, that shall avoid the errors and impossibilities of the old Protestant and rationalistic *theologia naturalis*. For such a natural theology the just outlined conscience-theology has not the means. Theocentric theology seeks to produce a natural theology in its own way.

So we come to the last form of theology to which there is occasion to allude. It is the specifically modern, the so-called "religious-scientific" or "religious-philosophical." It shimmers with many facets, but still it is possible in the end to present its decisive convictions. The theological work of Troeltsch, the leader of those historians of religion in the field of dogmatics whom we have here in view, makes this possible.

In this theology the controlling element is human religion, but surely not the living God. One has God solely in the capsule of religion, else one has Him not. The evolution of the religious mind in men is the field on which we are supposed to meet God. Here the majesty of God is brought over with a firm grip into the spirit life of man, and is stunted in the process. Hence the antithesis of this religious-historical theology to super-

naturalism. Hence the danger it runs of falling into the whirlpool of pantheism. Nothing serves to make the characteristic of this theology so clear as its judgment of the person of Christ. Jesus is for them merged completely in the stream of religious evolution. He is a member, of course, a prominent, or the most prominent, in the upward development of the religious mind of man. They reject with conclusive energy the thought that Jesus Christ is not merely a religious man but also at the same time the Son of God who is God's own and as such the unique revelation of God in history. They seek to believe not in Jesus Christ but only with Him. They seek to win the same relation to God as He. They seek to become children of God, as He. In opposition to this theology it is important that the living God, the Lord of heaven and earth, shall be freed from this limitation to man and his religion. The full necessity of a theocentric theology is here manifest. It seeks to prove that there is an objective revelation of God in nature and history, supremely in Christ, a revelation which, of course, can never be comprehended or made our own without the medium of faith or of religious experience, but which, however, as the basis or condition of religion, is something other than religion itself. Here unquestionably the most important task of all present-day theology is indicated. We must today oppose this mingling of God and man, of divine Spirit and human spirit which threatens as one of our greatest dangers. If we lose the supra-natural God, we have lost the best out of our life. But who will fail to see that this God and His objective revelation, above all, His Christ, have become dim? Some find God in religious evolution, others find Him in the ethical stirrings of the human heart, or, in general, in the depths of human nature. So the barrier between God and man, God and world, is overthrown. The result is that faith in God no longer lifts the soul above its own life and the world. It draws us deep into the life

of history. It loses its true redeeming, emancipating power. The question here is not at all about differences in theology or among theological schools. Great religious differences, differences in the whole conception of life and in the attitude towards life appear. The fight today is for the full lordship and majesty of God. The theological movement has come in this to its deepest, most decisive point, to the solution of the question regarding God Himself.

The preceding explanations have already indicated at several points how the positive scheme of a theocentric theology will present itself in its contents. It lives wholly by the revelation of God and by the experience which has its goal in faith; or, since this revelation comes to man only through the spirit of God, one may say that theocentric theology, in principle, lives by God's spirit and our faith. Thus it is concerned to secure for the question of the spirit of God the decisive place that belongs to it in the performance of theology's task. The problem of the spirit has never yet been grasped in evangelical dogmatics with anything approaching the earnestness and determination that it demands. It must not appear merely in a specified section of dogmatics under the title "Pneumatology," rather should it dominate the whole of dogmatics from beginning to end. For all that we have from God and Jesus Christ we have only through God's spirit. Or else we have it only through the word of God which makes the spirit of God alive for us. It is quite right that in modern religious circles so much should be said of the spirit of God, only it is important that people should have the right idea of the way the spirit comes to us, and of that which the spirit works in us.

Now, the fundamental working of the divine spirit is this, that it makes God a living reality for us as the power that has ourselves and our world unconditionally in its hand. In other words, the spirit of God creates in us the certainty that there is a personal Power above

us and our world, the world of which we are an integral part, a Power that we can never escape, from which, twist and turn as we will, we can never get free. What Psalm 139 confesses of the living experience of God, that is the fundamental conviction which we owe to the spirit of God. Faith at its root means: To be held by God as the absolute, personal Power over us and our world. This experience gives to faith the fundamental characteristic of humble submission. We have this experience, however, only as we come in touch with the revelation of the Holy Scripture which, differing in this from all other conceptions of God which religious humanity may have had, tells of this supra-natural majesty of God. If we have had this fundamental experience of God, then nature and history become a confirmation of this God, in a series of concrete movements. Both nature and history do but support our faith in Him. Yet we can now discern through nature and history further signs or qualities of this majesty of God. We recognize that the Lord God for us is also the Good, the Giver, the Glorious, the Clothed in Beauty, the Holy, the Helper, the Judge, the Loving, or the Giving Himself for Fellowship with Us. How this is conceived in detail, how our certainty of God, progressing through our contact with nature and history, becomes ever richer and deeper, cannot be further developed in this place. One thing only must be emphasized, that the love, or the redeeming gift of Himself by God to us, is revealed on the historical plane in Jesus Christ the Son of God. So there is in our conception a natural theology, an historical theology, but the keystone which unites their summit is Christology.

It is evident that this point of view of the conditions and origins of our certainty of God puts us now in the position to judge also the religions of the world in regard to the character of the truth they contain. We now possess the means to come to a valid conclusion about

the religious history of mankind. Starting from God, theocentrically, we can distinguish now truth from falsehood. None can doubt that such criticism of all human religions belongs also to the most serious tasks of the present day. We can carry on neither world-mission nor propaganda for Christianity if we are not clear on this point. But clearness will be gained only theocentrically, only from grappling with the question about God. For God is the controlling element in any religion that deserves the name. A religion has just as much truth itself as it has truth about God in itself.

Our sketch of theocentric theology must decline to touch on a series of modern isolated problems which are to be treated by this theology. Among these are the fundamental relation of dogmatics to the history of culture, to general religious history, with its development, and to the psychology of religion. Our only concern here is to present the basic structure of that theology. But one thing must still be emphasized. Whoever takes a general survey of German theology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will discover that it has been engaged in a constant inner analysis of its position towards the philosophy of Kant. It may lean on Kant, it may reject him, it may let itself be determined by single points of view in his philosophy,—in any case, it stands always under the after-effects of his work and under his personal influence. This condition has existed not merely since the rise of so-called New Kantianism in philosophy. Even Schleiermacher's dogmatics, to which the whole subsequent theological work of the nineteenth century in Germany is attached, cannot be understood at all without the analysis of its position towards the critique of Kant. Now surely one cannot assert that the relation in which theology stands to Kant has already been made thoroughly clear. Above all, there are two great questions that make trouble here. In the end we have to grapple with the problem whether theology

consists, as important groups since Schleiermacher assert, in purely practical ethically conditioned cognitions. The school of Ritschl especially holds this view, recently, for instance, Herrmann. The just described conscience-theology of Cremer and Kaehler holds it also. If this conception were true, then theology would not be affected at all by the critique of theoretical knowledge as Kant developed it. It would, in that case, have to do solely with man's practical reason, and would depend on the critical judgments which were formulated by Kant on this aspect of our spiritual life. We should then have the rule of practical Kantianism in theology. But if—and here is the second problem—the limitation of theology to practical, or ethically conditioned cognitions, is inadmissible, if the revelation of God in nature and history is in any way directed to our theoretic power of cognition, then the question is: how theology will dispose of the critique of theoretical reason according to Kant. Every system of dogmatics of our day must in this regard have its foundation in a theory of cognition. This appears, for instance, as soon as anyone takes in his hand Schlatter's *Dogmatik* in which the purely practical *habitus* of theology is energetically denied, while at the same time, in a theoretical way, a series of cognitions in relation to God are elaborated regarding which it is more than doubtful whether they would stand the test, were they brought face to face with the critique of Kant. Theocentric theology seeks to bring more clarity into the relation of dogmatics to Kant. It seeks, on the one hand, to show in how far dogmatic work is continuously dependent on Kant's theoretic critique, while, on the other hand, it seeks to throw light on the necessary freedom from that critique.[1]

[1] All that has been observed in this article with regard to theocentric theology has been elaborated in its wider connection by the author in his study, *Theocentric Theology, An Examination of the Doctrine of Dogmatic Fundamentals* (*Theocentrische Theologie, Eine Untersuchung zur dogmatischen Prinzipienlehre*), I. Historical Part, 1909; II, Systematic Part, 1914 (Leipzig, A. Deicher, publisher).

POSTSCRIPT: Theological work is a work of peace. Like all civilizing work it prospers only in times of peace. But the truth that it establishes must approve itself for all times, surely, too, in time of war.

Germany is now involved in one of the greatest wars that it has ever had to undergo. The whole world is moved by the question: How is this war affecting Germany? and above all, How will Germany end it? or How will she issue from it? This is not the place to speak of the confidence which Germany feels in the power and strength of her soldiers, the wisdom, energy and regulation of her military organization, the wisdom and manliness of her political leaders. Of these things, indeed, so much has been written in the press of Germany as well as of neutral countries that enlightenment in that regard is widespread. Here, where theological matters are the theme, the concern can be only to cast light on the position of Germany on another side. How in this war does Germany stand to the living God? We ask not only as to the ethical position of the German people. However important that is, whatever greatness of self-denial, sacrifice, self-surrender for the Fatherland, and of deep seriousness of life we see around us, ethical steadfastness is not alone at work. All depends on the living relation to the great Power of heaven and earth, to God. In good and in evil times a people is worth precisely what its faith is worth, or according as its faith is great and real. And on this point there is now no doubt that the relation to God in Germany is growing astonishingly, extensively and intensively. If one seeks the immediate cause of this fact, it lies in the conviction of the Germans that they have not wished this great, world-racking war, nor induced it by their diplomacy, but that it was forced on them and, in the interest of the preservation of their existence, is for them a necessity. Their righteous cause gives them assurance before God who guards the righteous cause. But the relation of our people to God is manifest

in still other ways. The number of the enemies of Germany, who all desire her abasement and humiliation, is great. Involuntarily in the face of this assault the eye is raised to the majesty of God which is the power over all earthly might and for which the earth itself with all its power and glory is but a drop in the bucket. The strength of our enemies does not hide from us the strength of God; no, it makes this clearer, surer, and greater for us. We humble ourselves before this power of God but our enemies too become small to us before it. God has *all* in His hand. And now at last we understand the love of God in Christ. The righteous, almighty God goes before us as the merciful God, who forgives sins, the sins of a people, too, if that people confess Him and seek His grace. So we hope, while our soldiers are struggling, brave to the death, on the battlefield, that God is guiding our cause to a happy issue. "Not by merit of works but by grace." But our inmost longing is not for war but peace. We say to ourselves that all the men who now stand opposed to one another in deadly enmity bear in themselves in very deed the image of *One* God, that they all are through Jesus Christ His redeemed, who with one accord should serve Him in His kingdom and, in the form of a peaceful labour for human progress, should lay the world at His feet. There must be peace once more, but, of course, only peace with justice; that is, a peace which shall not make it possible for any one nation to exalt herself over all the others and bring them under her power, but a peace that helps every nation to a worthy position, corresponding to the greatness of her strength and her resources. Peace and justice on earth, that is what we seek, and what German theology, too, inscribes on its banner.

The Churches, the War and the Future

By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

Among the many charges laid at the door of the war not the least serious is that it is supposed to mark the failure of Christianity and the bankruptcy of the Christian Churches. As the full horror of it all comes to be realized it is no wonder that men feel that there is something wrong in the conditions that made it possible. But it did not require any such demonstration as this to prove the comparative impotence of the Churches. The fact that we in England were faced last August with the dreadful alternative of either going to war or incurring a lasting national dishonour, while it made it possible to justify the war on the highest grounds, did nothing to excuse the conditions which forced us to such an alternative. For these conditions the Churches have their share of responsibility, and, if there is any meaning at all in the oft-repeated cry that this is a war in order to end war, it is that it is felt that the conditions which led up to the war were intolerable and must not be reproduced again when it is over. This can only come about by applying to international relations those ethical principles for which the Christian Churches all alike stand, but which they have not yet successfully applied to individual relations, or even to relations between Christian communities. That the Churches have not been altogether without influence in leavening the conscience of the community is shown by the widespread consensus of opinion that, under any truly Christian regime, the

appeal to arms as a method of settling disputes would be unthinkable, and that it is, at best, but a clumsy and barbarous device. But this feeling in itself constitutes a fresh challenge to the Churches, and urges them to work as they have never done yet for that new order in which the Christian ideal may have a chance of becoming a reality. It is not too much to say that the future of organized Christianity will very largely depend on the way in which this challenge is met.

At the moment of writing it is quite impossible to forecast the issue of the war, and any attempt to suggest the terms of peace would be both unprofitable and impertinent. But it is not too soon to begin to consider the situation which will arise when peace has been declared. It is universally hoped that the peace may be something more stable than the condition of armed suspicion which has prevailed in Europe for so long. But if that is to be so, a new atmosphere will have to be created, and one in which the Christian temper and ideals will be able to play a larger part than has ever been open to them hitherto. This is the task of the Churches. They will need, not only to bear the Christian witness, but so to set their own house in order that they may carry more weight with an unbelieving world, and remove that reproach of ineffectiveness which was too often attached to them.

To begin with, then, the Churches will need to stand far more rigorously for the superiority of moral and spiritual over material considerations. If they have seemed to many to speak with no authentic Christian voice during the present crisis, this has been because they have conformed too easily to the general standard, and assumed that force can only be met and defeated by force. But in the lull that will come when the armies have done their work it may be possible for saner counsels to be heard. It will be seen then that force is no real remedy, and that the breaking of militarism will not

of itself guarantee any better future for the world. Then will the Churches have their opportunity of preaching, "not by might, nor by power but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." But they will need also to believe and practise what they preach. There is some reason for the criticism that the Churches themselves have been too dependent on the arm of flesh. Their concern for money and numbers and organization has been in itself a concession to the materialism of the age, and has led to a neglect of the weightier matters of the law. If they are to persuade the nation that its real strength and prosperity will be, not in piling up greater armaments than ever, but in justice, mercy and love between man and man, they must themselves show the way by putting the first things first and keeping them there. While the war may very well lead to a belief in the bankruptcy of materialism, and cause men to hate the waste and confusion caused by appeals to carnal weapons, it is not likely to do much in the way of recommending a purely spiritual gospel. It may predispose men's minds to listen, but the Churches will have all that they can do in pleading their cause and adorning their doctrine. It is not therefore too soon for them to face the whole problem anew for themselves. There is always room for cultivating greater reality in religious life and speech, and for searching more deeply into the requirements and obligations of Christian ethics. Just now, and for the immediate future, discipline of this kind will be more than ordinarily fruitful.

There are at least two directions in which Christians can influence public opinion and where their influence is very much needed. The first is in regard to our attitude towards our enemies. War does not abrogate the Christian law of love. It is even possible to love our enemies. Love is quite compatible with fighting them, if it means seeking to drive out the evil spirit from them and exacting due punishment for their misdeeds. But it

must be done without bitterness. We must learn to think the best of them rather than the worst, to believe no evil of them till it is clearly proved, to see them as God sees them, to pray for them always, and to be ready for the time when we can again dwell together in peace. There is great room and opportunity for the Churches to set a higher standard in these matters than that of the world, and it has not been used as it might have been.

Another way in which public opinion may be leavened is by keeping it sensitive to the feelings of horror and pity. War easily breeds callousness. One cannot soon forget the pain of the first casualty lists; but now they are looked on with duller senses as but part of the inevitable price that must be paid. Even on the battlefield men's minds are soon blunted, and they come to look almost with indifference on the most ghastly and revolting scenes. There is something merciful about this, no doubt. But the Christian dare not blur or gloss over any of the most dreadful consequences of man's inhumanity to man. Imagination may boggle at the full tale of misery that has to be disclosed, but it is a clear duty to keep ourselves alive to its meaning, and our ears open to the cry of distress, that pity may have its perfect work. War is of the devil, we must suffer no specious pleas, no salve of use and wont to blind us to the fact.

The attempt to face such considerations as these must bring home the need for repentance and humiliation; and in this respect also the Churches can be at once a conscience and a mirror to the community at large. If we say we have no need to repent we deceive ourselves. We may be quite clear as to the justice of our cause, and that we can be as clear about this as we are is something to be very grateful for. But this does not mean that we are without sin. The very fact that the discipline of the war is doing us good shows that we needed it. It is bringing out fine qualities that had

long been suffered to lie dormant. It is purging us of our sloth and softness, our pride and our materialism. It may well therefore send us to our knees. We have forgotten God, we have lived unto ourselves, we have grown rich and lacked nothing. These are things that we must acknowledge and be sorry for before we can mend our ways; and if we are of the right spirit we shall be glad to have them brought to mind. Long before the war broke out there was evidence of a diminished consciousness of sin in the Churches. Much of their weakness, and especially the uncertain note in their teaching, might be traced to this source. It will be all to the good therefore if we can recover the humbler and more penitent tone, see things in a truer perspective, and become more conscious of our need. We must learn to preach the gospel of repentance before we can hope to proclaim the message, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

And we must work as well as pray and preach. Nothing about the war is more wonderful than the way in which it has brought out the spirit of service in all classes of the community. It is not only that the manhood of our Empire has responded nobly to the call, but that on every hand, and among the most unlikely people, there has been an eager desire to share the burden and privilege of service. Men and women who, up to the time of the war, had lived sheltered, easy, and comparatively selfish lives, have shown themselves ready to do anything and go anywhere at the call of their country's need. In all this the Churches and those connected with them have had their full share. Indeed there is some reason to fear that, in the multitudinous duties of the moment, there has been some loss of perspective and some failure to take that wide and calm view which the occasion demands. In any case the Churches have more to do than simply to share the burden of helpfulness which the crisis has called

forth. They will need to take measures to make it permanent, and to mobilize in some effective way the moral and spiritual capacities it has revealed. There are many who are helping now whose help the country needed before the war broke out and will continue to need long after it is over. The Germans are not the worst or the most persistent foes our civilization has to meet. There is the perpetual menace of the drink traffic, the dreary, hopeless irreligion of the masses in our towns, the helpless destitution of our submerged tenth. These are enemies that are always with us, and that the Christian Churches have been fighting for years with very inadequate resources. They will not be the less potent or threatening when the war is over, and there will be great need then for reinforcements in the army of workers engaged in this unequal strife. Is it too much to hope that many of those who are now giving their lives and their substance so freely for their country may be led to continue making the same sacrifices for Christ and His Church? When wrong is being done there is no real peace to be found in acquiescence. Men are called to continual spiritual warfare as long as there is evil in the world. The very same motives which urge so many just now to take up arms, in order to vindicate the right, hold good perpetually in regard to the strife between good and evil forces in the world. Though the weapons of this warfare are not carnal, the same high virtues of courage, discipline, and faith are needed in order to wield them, and, if young men and women would but believe it, there is in the Christian warfare an unequalled opening for heroism and self-sacrifice. If the Churches would but rise to the opportunities of leadership here presented to them, they might bring to the help of the Lord, against the mighty, vast hosts of those who are now learning for the first time something of the joy of service.

There is no doubt also that one effect of the war

will be to bring home to all thinking people the reality and legitimacy of vicarious sacrifice. Many of those who have revolted against the idea of Christ dying for them are surprised into acknowledging that soldiers are dying for them on the battlefield, and they do not resent it. Those of us who remain quietly at home, safe in this sea-girt isle inviolable, have our peace through the sorrow of others, our life through their willingness to die. This we are prepared to recognize in the amplest way. It is something for which we can never be sufficiently grateful. Yet it is but another illustration of that divine law of sacrifice which lies at the root of the whole Christian faith, and was exemplified in perfect fashion in the Cross of Jesus Christ. Here again is an opportunity for the Churches to revive the doctrine of the Cross, and, with it, to receive that new accession of power from on high which has always accompanied its preaching. The soul and centre of our religion is Atonement, and much of the weakness of its presentation in recent years has been due to the partial obscuration of this doctrine in favour of those of Incarnation and Revelation. The secret of the influence of Christianity throughout the ages lies in the fact of its being a religion of redemption. It has held and moved men, not merely by the perfection of its ethical teaching, or by the glory of the truth which it has declared, but by its power to save them from sin and from death. It is the fact of forgiveness through sacrifice lying at the heart of Christianity which converts it from a creed into a gospel, and it is when the Churches proclaim this that their word is with power. The Cross of Jesus Christ has given a new meaning to all sacrifice. It is at once a revelation and an impartation of God to man. So wherever love is, there is God. About the action of love there is always something original and incalculable, and it is the power of a new and endless life through love that gives pith and meaning to the Christian message. But at the same

time love is not mere easy benevolence. It is costly and means sacrifice. The fact that this view of it is being driven home upon the consciousness of mankind constitutes a real opportunity for the Churches.

Again, the war is familiarizing men and women with death in its saddest and most tragic forms, and is thereby raising questions that will demand an answer. The sudden and premature passing of thousands of strong young men involves a waste of human life that cannot be lightly justified by the excuse "*Sed miles, sed pro patria*", unless there is some hope for them beyond the grave. Now the Christian Church professes to be able to speak as to that hope in no uncertain tones. But for a long while past she has hardly lived up to her profession. The old half-materialist conceptions of heaven have fallen into disfavour, and nothing very satisfactory has taken their place. Indeed it has been another source of weakness in the Churches that their interests should have been so largely centred in this life. Other-worldliness has been at a discount, and a narrow horizon has meant a correspondingly restricted opportunity. Attempts to relegate to the background everything in the teaching of Christianity that savours of mystery, and to banish the supernatural, are not likely to help the Churches with those to whom life is more than the abundance of the things that they possess. If the Churches are really to gain the ear of the world they must have a distinctive message. They must stand for a higher ethic than that of the street and the market place, and they must be able to speak with assurance on things eternal and unseen. No amount of social interest or philanthropic work will be able to compensate for failure here. Unless Churches can speak to men of life in the largest and fullest sense, a life that is not bounded by the horizon of here and now, they will speak in vain. And now that men's minds are prepared by loss and trouble for some deeper insight into things than

their own unaided vision can give, there is an opportunity for the Churches which they will neglect at their peril.

But, if the occasion is to be used as it ought to be, one thing more is necessary. The Churches must learn to stand together and to speak with one voice as they have never done yet. So far as Great Britain is concerned the war has given rise to a wonderful manifestation of unity, and it is generally admitted that things will never again be quite as they were. When it broke out political tension was extreme. We were on the verge of something like revolution in Ireland, and party feeling ran very high. There was widespread industrial unrest, and men were anticipating industrial warfare on an almost unprecedented scale. The women's movement in its extremer forms had exasperated public opinion to a very dangerous point, and on every side the outlook was dark with impending strife. But all this came to an end in a moment under pressure of a grave national crisis. It was not merely that the sound of the enemy at the gate stilled the internal discord; but that the larger issues at stake for the time being obscured all minor ones, and men realized that they were Britons first and Irishmen, Liberals, Tories, Suffragists, or what not, only in the second place. Now is it not time that something of the same kind happened in the Christian Church? It may be that men have not sufficient imagination to realize that in the spiritual hosts of wickedness we are confronted by an enemy whose strength might well compel us to close our ranks and stand together. And probably a union so forced would never be very effective, and might disappear whenever the pressure was removed.

But is there not in that wider conception of the Kingdom of God which all the Churches profess to serve, a bond of union which might be made more effective than it is? No doubt there has been of late

years a very marked development of the spirit of union, and signs are not wanting that the shame and scandal of our unhappy divisions are beginning to come home. But as yet it is only the fringe of the Churches that has been touched by this new and better spirit. So far as the rank and file are concerned there is still on the Anglican side enough scorn of dissent to make co-operation unthinkable, and on the side of the Free Churches a sore and bitter spirit that leads straight to misunderstanding. At the same time there is among the different sections both of Anglicanism and Non-conformity a jealousy and rivalry which keeps them apart when they should be most at one. An army in which every regiment is fighting for its own hand is a pretty hopeless engine of war. Now this deplorable state of things will never be brought to an end by any schemes of reunion however perfect on paper. What is needed is a new spirit and a new perspective. We are beginning to understand that unity must mean something more than uniformity, and that it is not necessary to invent some *tertium quid* of undenominationalism as a means of bringing denominations together. Even the most sectarian spirits are willing to admit that the sects serve an end beyond themselves, and that the Christian religion is something larger than any of the Churches which represent it. In the general Christian witness of the English-speaking peoples no one Church has a monopoly, and it is quite hopeless to suppose that the time will ever come when such a monopoly can be established. There is however a real gain in the diversity, if only the different sections of the Church can learn to live together in peace, and to co-operate so far as possible for the ends of the Kingdom. No one of them need abandon anything that it regards as essential in order to do this. But seeing that they have a common aim, and are all seeking to bring men to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and to a life that is hid

with Christ in God, it should at least be possible for them to work and pray together. If they can do no more than is implied in their Lord's saying, "He that is not against us is on our side", that would at least be better than the attitude of more or less veiled dislike and hostility which they sometimes show.

We are told that in the trenches in Flanders the chaplains of all denominations have no difficulty in working together. There is one story of a Jewish Rabbi there who was found holding up a Crucifix before the dying eyes of a French Roman Catholic soldier. It was the only way in which he could bring to the man the comfort and help he needed. When things are "bare to the buff", and we have to face the elemental needs of the soul in its extremity, the Christian message is much the same for all men. At such times denominational distinctions are of all things the most irrelevant. Now, when this war is over, the Christian Churches will find themselves face to face with an almost desperate situation. It will then be a question as to whether the future of European civilization is to be built up on armed force, or is to be shaped anew by moral and spiritual means. It will need the united weight and witness of all the Churches to win any consideration for their point of view. Already there are signs that we shall be called upon to face a vast recrudescence of materialism and militarism. This is only what was to be expected under the circumstances, but it contains no promise of a better future, and can only open out before our eyes an endless vista of wars and rumours of wars. There is a better way, and it rests largely with the Churches to secure its adoption.

But there is also another danger. The impotence of the Churches is leading men of weight and wisdom to look in other directions for help in securing the peace of the world. Dr. Eliot, for example, writes in a recent article:

"When, therefore, one says that if there be any short road to general peace it must lie through the region of ethics, one cannot mean the region of instituted religion, as illustrated in various forms of organized Christianity. Fortunately there is another region in which human culture gives force to ethics—the great region of law national and international—and this region of law has been wonderfully illuminated in latter days by the light of truth economic, chemical, physical, biological, sociological. It is in this region of law and truth that the short road towards peace, if there be any, will be found."

Now it is quite true, as Dr. Eliot also suggests, that the Christianity of the future, if it is to be effective, will have to be far more pronouncedly ethical in tone. But this is a very different thing from saying that the place of Christianity must be taken by some ethical system expressed in international law. Any such system apart from the sanctions and driving force which religion can give would be utterly powerless. And if we urge that the chance of peace in the future lies with the Churches it is because with them alone is to be found the impulse which can make good their ideal. They have a great task and a great opportunity before them, and to all those who are sceptical as to their outlook they can answer in the words:

"Dreamers of dreams! We take the taunt with gladness,
Knowing that God, beyond the years you see,
Hath wrought the dreams that count with you for madness,
Into the substance of the life to be."

Byzantium the Preserver of Orthodoxy[1]

By Professor Ivan Ivanovich Sokoloff,
Ecclesiastical Academy, Petrograd.

Being in its essential points an attempt to bring out the historical character of Byzantium in relation to Orthodoxy, this essay contains certain elucidations of a question which is both important and vital for modern times. The roots of Russian polity are in Byzantium. The inheritance of the Russian people in the realm of ecclesiastical and religious relations came from Byzantium. Byzantium was the first teacher of Russian science, literature and art. Byzantium gave to Russians their early views of society, of family, and of personal duty. Byzantium has always been diligently studied in Russia as a kind of legacy from which comes the whole history of the country. But even for Russian investigators Byzantium still remains in many points an obscure riddle.

Yet the Orthodox Byzantium lived, was agitated by and tried to solve the same harassing questions which, in our day, again and again demand the attention of the social consciousness, in all the vital importance and varied bearing of their forces, being of paramount interest to ecclesiastical communities, keeping individual minds on the alert, and demanding a satisfying, definite solution for individuals and social organizations alike.

And, indeed, what is the essence of Orthodoxy, of the Universal, Ecumenical Orthodoxy (οἰκουμενικὴ ἤτοι καθολικὴ,

[1] Translated by Vera Johnston.

ὀρθοδοξία)? Modern society answers the question in many varied ways, considering this essential idea and defining its moral significance from very different points of view. But this variety of opinions would disappear if we were to deal historically with the question of Universal Orthodoxy, examining the historical surroundings in which it grew and developed, in which it was always felt, like the very pulsation of the spirit, in the life of individuals and communities, of the Church and the State.

Such was Byzantium, the treasure house of Orthodoxy. It nurtured and completed within its own heart the ideal of moral perfection for individuals and communities; it lit the beacon-light of the true faith in our country, and introduced ancient Russia to the regions of religion and morality.

I

Byzantium was pre-eminently the kingdom of religion. In the Christian sense it was a theocratic monarchy, with an Orthodox Emperor, anointed of God, at its head. Byzantine legislation was especially forcible and expressive on the question of the religious element in the origin and function of imperial authority. The Emperor was the agent of God on earth. He must comply strictly with the Holy Scripture and the dogmas established by the Seven Ecumenical Councils; his Orthodoxy and piety[2] must be thoroughly tried and proven; he must confess the true doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Divine Logos. The ultimate function of imperial authority was to do good;[3] therefore the title of benefactor was given to the Emperor; if the activity of the Emperor weakened in the direction of good deeds, it meant that the very nature of the imperial authority was perverted. As early as the fifth century a church coronation became indispensable for the establishment

[2] ἐπισημότατος ἐν 'ορθοδοξίᾳ καὶ εὐσεβείᾳ ὀφειλει εἶναι ὁ βασιλεὺς (*Epanagoge*, II, ε', p. 66, Lipsiae 1852).

[3] τὸ εὐεργετεῖν.

of authority. The crowning took place in the cathedral of St. Sophia, with great magnificence and court ceremonial, the Patriarch of Byzantium officiating in person. But before the beginning of the ceremony the future Emperor had to hand to the Patriarch a confession of the Orthodox faith, written in his own hand, which was followed by a promise always to remain an obedient son of the Holy Church, to protect the Church, and to follow its true teaching.

Having at its head an Orthodox monarch, the Byzantine Empire was inhabited in its totality by an Orthodox population, in spite of the variety of race and language. The motley ethnographical mixture of the Byzantine populace was made one by the unity of its Orthodox faith, which stood above all national subdivisions. Orthodoxy was, as it were, the supernationality of Byzantium, being the basic element of the life of the State and people. Side by side with the Byzantine State stood the Church, as a separate, independent organization, whose object was the building up of the Kingdom of God and the eternal salvation of all its members. It had its own laws and was governed by special powers headed by the Patriarch and the Holy Synod. Orthodox Byzantium evolved the exalted idea of its Patriarch being the intercessor of the Church and the bearer of the high objects of its service. In Byzantium, the Patriarch was the inspired visible image of Christ, expressing truth in word and deed. His object was to preserve in piety and moral purity all those whom he received from God into his spiritual wardenship; to convert to Orthodoxy and communion with the Church all those who were not connected with it, and to draw unbelievers into the midst of the followers of the true faith—all through his exalted and wonderful activity. The Patriarch was thought to be the people's spiritual father, appointed of God, the initiator of all good, the guide to all perfection, the chief pastor of God, and the

intercessor before Him for his spiritual flock. The Patriarch was the universal teacher in all matters of faith and morality, the guardian of divine laws and canons, who daringly raised his voice in defence of the Church's dogmas and the truth, even against the Emperor. Also the Patriarch must explain to the Emperor the needs and conditions of the Church, representing its autonomous government. He had the right to intercede before the Emperor for the destitute, the persecuted and the unjustly accused, and thus he was the medium through whom love of one's neighbour, charity and justice, were widely introduced into the society of Byzantium. The Patriarch even had the right to judge assassins and other criminals, subjecting them to church punishments alone, which made them immune from secular justice.

All this bore witness to the domination of ecclesiastical ideas and the supreme importance of religious principles in the life of the Byzantine community. History offers us numerous concrete cases of both the Patriarch and the Emperor being entirely penetrated with the principles of Orthodox ecclesiasticism. But for all the influence *de jure* and *de facto* which his position assured to him, the Patriarch was never the "pope" of the Orthodox East, as has been stated by certain savants who have failed to understand the system of Byzantine ecclesiasticism. The Patriarch did not rule alone, but jointly with the Holy Synod, over which he presided and which always and invariably acted in the Church of Byzantium as an institution both judicial and administrative, acting in council. The authentic type of the supreme Byzantine Church government was exactly the organic combination of the autocratic principle, expressed in the functions of the Patriarch, and the principle of collective administration, expressed in the functions of the Synod.

Moreover, the principle of collective administration was expressed in the activity of both the ordinary peri-

odical Councils and the extraordinary Councils, specially called, which followed each other in an unbroken chain during the Middle Ages. Besides the Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Church of Byzantium, other Eastern Patriarchs (namely, of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem) were always present at these Councils and sometimes even at the regular sessions of the Synod. Therefore, the Holy Synod and, still more, the Councils, fully reflected the idea both of the collective work of the whole local Church of Byzantium and of the co-operation of the prelates of all the local Churches of the East. It is also noteworthy that when, at the death of a Patriarch, his see was vacant, the Synod gave out no verdicts on important Church matters, merely preparing the material for future verdicts, which were to be issued only when there was a new chairman of the Holy Synod. On the other hand, the Patriarch never made any decisive judgments on the more important affairs by himself, acting only upon such resolutions as he made with the Holy Synod, both with regard to synodal affairs and the more important affairs of Councils.

This demonstrates once more that the ecclesiastic rule in Byzantium was truly a combination of the personal and the collective principles. Brotherly affection marked the relations between the Synod and the Patriarch. The Patriarch was the "elder brother" of the Byzantine hierarchs, and they were his "beloved brethren", fellow servants in his patriarchal work.[4]

Owing to this universal domination of Orthodoxy, binding together all the members of the Church as well as all the subjects of the Empire, a special system of relations between the Church and the State was evolved. A close union and mutual helpfulness characterized it, the inner organization of each remaining perfectly independent. The State helped the exterior welfare of the

[4] *Prōtos adelphos* and *agapētoi adelphoi*, Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia*, I, 34, Bonnae.

Church, furthered the objects of ecclesiastical authority, guaranteeing outward conditions favourable for their realization, giving its support to the Church whenever the Church needed it, as, for instance, when it founded new eparchies or missions within and without the Empire; and also providing financially for the Cathedral of St. Sophia and the Patriarchal court, etc.

The influence of the Church upon the State was, however, more many-sided and more exalted. It imparted to the whole organism of the State the character of Christian activity on the basis of Orthodoxy; it perfected the principles of statesmanship under the guidance of Orthodox ecclesiasticism so that the activity of the government also was ruled by Christ's teaching of love and charity. According to the Byzantine idea, the State only fulfilled its object when it was organized on the foundations of Orthodoxy, when the spirit of Orthodox ecclesiasticism permeated it and it lived in union with the Church, becoming itself churchlike under its beneficent influence. But for all this, the principle of the independence of the State never suffered. The dualism of power—the imperial and the patriarchal—was very strictly and consistently adhered to. The State and the Church were thought to be two organizations, destined for different purposes and independent in their inner life. If the Byzantine Patriarch, through the very nature of his purpose and service, was free from any pretension to secular authority and civic representation, the Emperor, on the other hand, was checked in his inclination to be king and pope at the same time not only by the activity of the Patriarch, who was just as great and as necessary a representative of the same Byzantine polity,[5] but still more by the rules of the Church and the whole code of religion and morality of the Supreme

[5] Τῆς πολιτείας ἐκ μερῶν καὶ μορίων ἀναλόγως τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ συνισταμένης, τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα μέρη βασιλεύς ἐστι καὶ πατριάρχης (*Epanagoge*, III, ή, p. 68).

Lawgiver and Judge, our Lord Jesus Christ. This code was binding on the Emperor as the eldest son of the Orthodox Church of Byzantium. Under these conditions the inner power of Catholic Orthodoxy reached its full development, its essential elements and manifestations attaining the definiteness of perfection, the vitality and reality of which preserve their value to this day. The historical merit of Byzantium as the preserver of Orthodoxy is truly great and important.

II

In Byzantium the most vital significance was given to the principle of *akribeia* (ἀκρίβεια τῶν δογμάτων) or the strict preservation of the dogmas of the Universal Church, the one Catholic Church, as it remained until the deplorable fact of the separation of the Churches, in 1054. Properly speaking, Orthodoxy constitutes the preservation of the principles of the Universal Church in their authentic form, undistorted and whole, inheriting and assimilating authentic primitive Christianity as it was taught by Lord Christ the Saviour and the Apostles, complying with the teachings of the holy Fathers of the Church, as they come directly from the original source, and unswervingly following the resolutions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils.

It is on the foundation of this priceless treasure of faith and life that Byzantium built up the rule of the *akribeia of dogmas*, imposing it on the consciousness and activity of the Church. It is noteworthy that this principle became vitally important chiefly after the Seventh Ecumenical Council, when schismatical tendencies began to show in the West, and the Byzantine Councils, in the ninth century and later, discussed the problems which became the foundation of the estrangement between the Latin Church and the Eastern Orthodox. It is clear that the *akribeia* of dogmas specially belonged to Byzantine theological thought and Orthodox ecclesiastical life.

The essence of this principle demanded that dogmas such as the Seven Ecumenical Councils decreed them, the whole undivided Church taking part in the Councils, must be fully preserved for ever, without the slightest deviation or distortion, unconditionally by all the members of the Church, independently of position or title, from the Emperor and the Patriarch to the last subject of the Empire and the least of the spiritual members of the Church. No compromise was admissible, no reservations were to be thought of, no relaxation or excuses to be accepted. Each and all, always and in all circumstances, must confess in a strict and exact way, the dogmatical teaching of the Church, without any deviations from motives of personal position or conditions of social life. It was accepted that the teaching of the Holy Church, as it was revealed in the decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, was divine and infallible; therefore, to confess it was a necessary condition of moral perfection and salvation. Heresy was the greatest crime against God and the Church, because it distorted divine revelation and the true Orthodox faith, and led to moral death. The faithful must avoid intercourse with heretics.

The representation and true expression of the Church is in the hierarchy, the assembly of bishops, who are the chiefs and the beacon-lights of the faithful, the successors of the holy Apostles, carrying on the service of Christ, Who is the Head of the Church, forming with it one perfect body. Such was the theology of the Patriarch Photius, the most celebrated representative of the strictly Orthodox science of Byzantium, who firmly established in the social consciousness of Byzantium the fundamemtal necessity of exact compliance with the Church dogmas.

During the Middle Ages, Byzantium preserved this principle most rigorously. The Church Councils called in Byzantium from the middle of the ninth century to

the middle of the fifteenth are the chief proof of it. These Church Councils began in the days of Photius, when the contentions of the Church of Rome were defined for the first time and the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son (*Filioque*) in particular was discussed; they continued to be called all through the reign of the Komnenos dynasty, when many heresies sprang up within the Byzantine Church (originated by John Itala, who once more took up the theories of Origen and tried to reconcile Christianity and Neo-Platonism; by Nilus the Monk, who shared the error of the Monophysites; by the Metropolitan Leo of Chalcedon, who taught wrongly concerning the reverencing of holy images; by the Metropolitan Eustratios of Nicea, who restored Nestorianism; by the sects of the Bogomils, the Paulicians, the Euchitians or Massalians); they were called to deal again with the disputes arising in connection with the sacrifice of the Eucharist, with the words, "My Father is greater than I" (St. John 14:28), with the Anathema against the God of Mahomet and the false teaching of Siciditus, who said that the Holy Sacrament was corruptible; and they (the Church Councils) lasted until the reign of the Paleologos dynasty, when there was a whole series of Councils for the discussion of Church union between the East and the West.

The numerous Church Councils during these six centuries had but one object: the preservation of the dogmas of the Ecumenical Church, unchanged and unshaken. The members of the Church must be shielded from opinions not in harmony with the Creed of Nicea and Constantinople and the decrees of the other Ecumenical Councils. The *akribeia* of dogmas must be preserved, as the most precious treasure come down from the epoch of the dogmatic self-definition of the Universal Church.

The Byzantine Church realized this object perfectly and completely. As is affirmed by the *Synodic* during the Week of Orthodoxy, "This Apostolic faith, this

patristic faith, this orthodox faith—the faith that maintains the world". The *Synodic* is a book containing all the decrees of the Byzantine Church issued during the six centuries of Councils, on the one hand to guard and preserve the dogmas of their Ecumenical predecessors, and, on the other, to announce the judgments of the Church with regard to the dogmatic errors of the time. The *Synodic* was read for the first time during the Sunday of the Week of Orthodoxy, March 11, 843, in the Cathedral of St. Sophia; and thereafter the reading of it took place yearly in the presence of the Patriarch and the Emperor, the statesmen, the Synod, the guards of the Emperor and the Patriarch, and great crowds of people. Thus it came as a yearly confession of faith by the whole Church.

Moreover, in mediaeval Byzantium the *akribeia* of dogmas was also preserved by means of theological writings. Byzantium's heritage in this respect was of the richest. Most unfortunately, it has not been properly classified to this day, existing for the most part in manuscripts scattered through the various archives of the East and West. Insufficient acquaintance with the theological literature of Byzantium often leads men of learning into errors as to the true measure of its importance. Yet in as far as the *akribeia* of dogmas was reflected in this literature, the latter is of great value and importance. What makes it so important is the fact that, though, in obedience to the tendency of preserving the purity and integrity of Orthodox doctrines, Byzantine theology had to discuss the same themes, as the need of the time demanded, it never repeated what had been said before. For these discussions went on through many centuries and, answering the demands of the ecclesiastical community of the time, they were always of general interest for people of newer periods. For instance, every Christian document concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, which was part of a very extensive group of

Byzantine writings, dealt with different details of this profound subject, in a phase which corresponded to the new demands of the Byzantine society of the period. Moreover, as a whole, Byzantine theological literature on dogmatic themes and dogmatic polemics is an invaluable commentary to the *Synodic*, which we have mentioned above and which was certainly the outcome of the whole dogmatic activity of Byzantium throughout the Middle Ages.

The great wealth and variety of theological writings became the foundation on which stood the *akribeia* of dogmas; it also became its protection not only against the errors that arose within the Byzantine Church itself, but also, what is especially important, in relation to the Church of Rome. The latter, in spite of the systematic and productive labours of the learned Byzantine theologians, adhered to its fundamental error concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father but also from the Son, disregarding the traditional *akribeia* of Byzantium. By reason of this, however, the endeavours of the Roman Church to gain the mastery over the Church of the East—under the form of a union—were of no avail with Byzantine theologians; to break the rule of the *akribeia* was too widely accepted in Byzantium as a *testimonium paupertatis* of the Latin West in regions of Ecumenical Orthodoxy. This was a triumph of principle which retained its value for theological science and literature as well as for historical actuality. Here a principle was transmuted into living reality acquiring real importance.

There are other historical instances of the practical application of dogmatic *akribeia* which holds such universal sway in Byzantium. The Emperors, according to law, must be of the Orthodox faith, and, before ascending the throne, an Emperor in a public ceremony solemnly promised that he would protect the Church and the Orthodox faith. The Patriarchs also read, at their consecra-

tion, the confession of faith which contained the dogmatical decrees of the Ecumenical and the local Byzantine Councils, which concerned the Synodic. The homology of diocesan bishops, in the order of their chirotony, was composed after the same pattern. Moreover, in virtue of his position and authority, and his very calling, the Patriarch accepted the duty of upholding Orthodoxy even against the Emperor. It was his duty, in case of any deviation from the purity of the Orthodox faith and practice, to raise his voice boldly in defence of the truth, regardless of persons, the power of temporary circumstances or subjective conditions. History offers many examples of the Patriarch courageously standing for the defence of dogmatic truths, especially during the period of iconoclastic attacks and then, later on, when union with Rome was attempted, and when from political motives, in terrible danger of a Turkish invasion, the Emperors of Byzantium showed lack of tenacity and stability in their dogmatic views. Let us take the example of Michael VIII Paleologos (1261–1282), who was drastically denounced by the Patriarchs Arsenius and Joseph for his inclination to compromise with Rome.

Compliance with the *akribeia* of dogmas was not restricted to the upper ecclesiastical and secular circles. It was as firmly believed in by the monks and the lower classes of Byzantium. Byzantine monasticism had reached a high degree of development and eminence; the number of both monks and monasteries was enormous. It was not without reason that Byzantium was called the kingdom of monks, and that the Western Crusaders declared it was one uninterrupted monastery. The influence of the monks on the ecclesiastical and private life of the people was enormous, and what they did for Orthodoxy for the sake of the principle of dogmatic *akribeia* is one of their greatest achievements. The monks helped Orthodoxy to triumph over the heresy of the iconoclasts in 843; they were the chief opponents

of John Itala's heresy, which distorted the dogma of the Incarnation of our Lord by tinging it with Neo-Platonic ideas; they opposed the false teachings of Barlaam and Akyndinos concerning the essence and activity of the Deity, etc.

The masses stood behind the monks, supporting all their labours on behalf of the purity of Church doctrines. The masses of Byzantium still had the moral cast of those who lived in the Greco-Roman Empire in the early days of Christianity. Religious feeling and a lively interest in Church affairs were inborn with them; also a love of Church services and celebrations of every kind. The people were deeply interested in patriarchal elections, and if they thought the Patriarch lacked courage in his defence of the truths of religion before the Emperor, they boldly raised their own voices to protect the *akribeia* of dogmas, as they understood it; and their protest would not stop before a revolt or even a dethronement of the culprits. The sovereigns of Byzantium might try many experiments with the property, the persons and even the life of their subjects, and the people would put up with anything. But if a sovereign attempted to raise a desecrating hand against the sacred heritage of Orthodox dogmas—woe to him! A swift sense of pain ran through the whole national organism, accompanied by more or less marked perturbations in all spheres of the life of the State.

The masses of Byzantium were intelligent in their attitude towards religious matters and were able to give an account of their faith. In the Middle Ages, Byzantium was covered by a whole network of schools for the people, supported by the Emperor or the Patriarch, by parishes or by monasteries, by private families and houses. The education of the people was cared for by the Emperors and the Patriarchs, by diocesan bishops and government dignitaries; in this field laboured the married parochial clergy and the monks;

the cause of the popular schools was supported by all the best people of the secular communities. Schools for the people did not exist only in towns; a school was a requisite of a village as much as a church. The light of knowledge penetrated everywhere, dissipating the darkness of ignorance. The teachers were chiefly clerical persons or monks, the subjects of study being "divine and sacred scripture," namely, the Psalter, the Books of the New Testament, and the works of the holy Fathers. The character of instruction in these schools was ecclesiastic and religious. All the work of the schools was so conducted that the people learned the truths of Orthodoxy, acquiring an intelligent attitude towards religious matters and the ability to give an account of their faith. Moreover, life itself taught the people in the same way. No sooner were the iconoclastic troubles settled, the dogma of reverencing holy images subsiding from public attention, than there arose the difficult problem of the procession of the Holy Ghost; and for nearly four centuries afterward, each time new attempts at the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches were made, it remained the object of passionate contention among the clerical and secular authorities, the educated people and the common masses alike. As in the early centuries, heated discussions took place in the streets and public squares, for Byzantium also had its adherents of reconciliation with Rome, and people of all classes tried to establish the difference between the expressions "*Ex Filio*" and "*Per Filium*," and the right *oikonomia* in questions of faith as compared with the way in which the holy Fathers understood this principle, etc. The attempts to reconcile the Churches were the cause of minute discussions of many other dogmatical, ritualistic and economical questions, making the adherents of both sides keen in understanding essential points, in defining the Orthodox and the Latin views of the subject, and in defending the

Orthodox position against all assailants. Numerous Byzantine literary works shed a clear light on the true nature of these dogmatical discussions, generally preserved in the form of dialogues between an Orthodox and a Roman Catholic, and generally dealing with the question of the *Filioque*. Even the uneducated masses created a kind of literature of their own on polemical themes which also took the form of conversations between the Roman *kaldenaria* (cardinals) and an Orthodox Byzantine, the latter, of course, proving to be right as a representative of the Byzantine *akribeia* of dogmas.

Another group of Byzantine polemical literature had for its subject the dualistic heresies, renewed from time to time in the teachings of the Paulicians, the Bogomils, etc., and yet another group was directed against Armenians, Jews and Mahometans. Later on, under the Komnenos and the Paleologos dynasties, there were new discussions of Orthodox dogmatics, in view of additional objections to the exact and strict understanding of various details.

As to the educated Byzantines, their interest in and their attentive attitude towards theological problems has never since been equalled. In the language of the Byzantines, to be educated meant to be well informed chiefly in theology, so that laymen were frequently remarkably learned in theology, devoting themselves to ecclesiastical learning and literature. The theological atmosphere of the Byzantine schools permeated the palaces of Emperors, the State Councils and the homes of the aristocracy. One meets with a remarkable phenomenon in Byzantine literature: Emperors, ministers and statesmen of all ranks stand side by side with the hierarchs of the Church, the clergy and the monks as theological authors. Almost every secular person who ever wrote on philosophic, legal or historical themes was also studying theological subjects. The Emperor Leo VI the Wise preached in church, having carefully

prepared his sermons. Another ruler, Emanuel II of the Komnenos family, was so well versed in all the intricacies of the controversies as to the incorruptibility of the Eucharist, the Incarnation of the Word, etc., that the Metropolitan Eustacios of Thessalonia, who was himself famous for his theological learning, greatly admired the thoroughness of his information, the refinement of his judgment, and the power of his dialectical thought. Alexis I, also a Komnenos, spent days and nights in trying to persuade the followers of the dualistic heresy that they were in error. Constantinople was convulsed by the new ideas of John Itala, the *hypatos* of philosophers, as he was called, who taught that matter was pre-existent and indestructible, that it shaped itself on the pattern of eternal ideas, that our souls had always existed and will always exist in new incarnations, that the world was everlasting, and that everything must return to its original condition, the dead at their resurrection coming in new spiritual bodies. He explained the working of miracles in a rational way, as well as the association of the different natures in the person of Jesus Christ. In view of all this, the Emperor Alexis Komnenos asked his brother Isaac to go into the matter thoroughly, acquainting himself well with the theories of John Itala. The important point was that the Emperor's brother, a layman, the *sebastokrator* Isaac, was quite sufficiently trained in theology and philosophy to appreciate at its true worth the complicated world concept of the *hypatos* of philosophers, first publicly to prove the falsehood of his teaching, and then to deliver him into the hands of the Church. The wife of the same Emperor Alexis was devoted to the writings of the holy Fathers of the Church, and was especially influenced by the mysticism of St. Maximus the Confessor.

Thus, the imperial courts of Byzantium cherished the tradition of its lofty interest in theological and philosophical matters. Emperors and members of royal families

did more than support men of learning and found schools; as was shown above, they contributed personally to public discussions on theology and to theological literature. Such were the Emperors Constantine VII Porphyrogenes, Theodore II Lascaris, John VI Kantacusenos, Emanuel II Paleologos, and many others. The higher social circles of Byzantium followed the example of their monarchs and the distinguished and devoted writers on theological subjects and controversial points among the high officials, civic and military, were many.

These historical facts demonstrate Byzantium's inborn task of conservation with regard to the *akribeia* of dogmas of the Ecumenical Church. The idea of a Universal Orthodoxy incessantly grew stronger in the general consciousness of the Church, in perfectly defined historical surroundings, in an atmosphere of generally sympathetic and intense attention on the part of all classes of the Church community, their religious sense constantly and carefully centered on this or that side of truth conformably to the contemporary needs and the insistent demands of life. The meaning of a Universal Orthodoxy was gradually understood in a clearer and a more profound way, its historical succession was established; and all this resulted in the dogmatic truths being presented to the Byzantine community with the perfect exactitude and expressiveness of definitions decreed by the Ecumenical Councils. Universal Orthodoxy was understood as the original Christian faith in its original purity. It shone throughout Byzantium as the faith of the Apostles, the faith of the Fathers, as the only Orthodox faith that maintains the world.

III

This, however, is only one side of the matter; the other side is the working ethical significance of universal Orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy is more than the *akribeia* of dogmas; it is

more than a perfect intellectual grasp of the faith of the Apostles and the Fathers: it is a real power, an inexhaustible concrete energy. Orthodoxy is life itself and life's activity, permeated within with dogmatic data, an unreserved obedience and a hearty submission to the belief of the Apostles, the holy Fathers, and the Ecumenical Councils. At the foundation of all life and activity Byzantine Orthodoxy evolved a special practical rule, namely, the exact compliance with the church rules or the *akribeia of canons.* The dogmas of faith and the canons of church discipline alike, as far as they concerned daily customs and conduct, must be complied with, in their literal authentic meaning; their working power must not be in any way lessened or weakened by the least indulgence or other motives, be they subjective or objective, irrespective of anything conditional in the circumstances of individuals or communities, in fact, regardless of persons altogether. Church canons were binding equally on all members of the Church. And no deviation in their application must be allowed. Whoever disobeyed the rules of the Church must be sternly judged by the ecclesiastical authority and must accept the full punishment prescribed by the same rules. All were equal before the authority of these rules; even kings were bound to obey the canons in all strictness and exactitude. Men were "not to transgress the eternal boundaries laid down by the holy, divinely inspired Fathers"—such was the decree of the *akribeia.* The decree of the Council of Constantinople, in 843, which is part of the Synodic read on the Sunday of the Week of Orthodoxy, stated with regard to the iconoclasts: "Let all things innovated and done, or which shall hereafter be done, contrary to the tradition of the Church, and the teaching and pattern of the holy and glorious Fathers, be Anathema."[6]

[6] *Ἅπαντα τὰ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν καὶ ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀοιδίμων πατέρων καινοτομηθέντα καὶ πραχθέντα ἢ μετὰ τοῦτο πραχθησόμενα, ἀνάθεμα.*

This was the intellectual presentation of the *akribeia* of canons. History tells us of the various practical ramifications of this command.

First of all, a very considerable part of the Byzantine community readily consented to be guided by this principle. It was the ruling principle of Byzantium's life, especially after the ninth century, when St. Theodore of Studia traced it on the banner of almost the whole Church community of Byzantium. This became apparent chiefly in 843, when the Church of Byzantium was triumphant not only over the iconoclasts infringing on the *akribeia* of dogmas, but also over the opponents of the *akribeia* of canons, who insisted on various compromises and deviations, and were extreme in their understanding and application of another principle: that of the *oikonomia* of the canons.

The triumph of Orthodoxy was won in the name of the ecclesiastical *akribeia* as, side by side with the preservation of dogmas, it glorified the inviolability and the universal binding force of the canons, even upon the highest officers of the State. This view of the canons was accepted by the Patriarchs and the provincial archbishops, by many educated laymen and the parochial clergy, and especially by the monks and the common people. The masses became familiar with the idea of the *akribeia* of canons in ecclesiastical schools and grew still more certain of it, owing to the whole trend of contemporary life and the collisions of a practical order which frequently arose around them. Moreover, in all such matters the masses found very energetic guides in the monks of Byzantium, especially in those of the famous monastery of Studia in Constantinople, who themselves complying with the church canons in the strictest way, relentlessly demanded the same obedience from all other members of the Church, from kings and subjects alike, insisting on the disciplinary punishment of all transgressors, whatever their social rank. Monas-

ticism had its members and adherents among the Patriarchs and archbishops, among the members of royal families and imperial courtiers, and even among the ministers of State. It was a very numerous community, strong in spirit and in influence, which arose unanimously and energetically every time the canons of the Church were threatened in their purity and integrity, their exact and strict observation. The masses and the classes of Byzantium followed their example, with the result that the *akribeia* of canons was also a true index of Byzantium's faithfulness to the ecumenical principles characteristic of Orthodoxy in secular life as well as in church practices.

The *akribeia* of canons was operative both in the private and the public life, where rules of faith and morality were concerned, or the demands of ecclesiastical good order or good conduct, or, in the case of priests and monks, the fulfilment of the duties of their office. The conditions imposed by the *akribeia* were to be obeyed by individuals and communities under the penalty of various forms of penance and of exclusion from Holy Communion, in case of the laity, and, in case of the clergy, of being deprived of their grade; laymen and clergymen alike were in danger of *anathema,* which meant being altogether cast out from the Church.

If we examine the memoranda of history we shall see that the *akribeia* of canons was observed in Byzantium with great consistency and system; the people of Byzantium were ever conscious of it, and its observation was really the characteristic feature of the Byzantine Church all through the mediaeval period. We need not even mention the common members of the ecclesiastical community, so entirely was their life watched and controlled by their ecclesiastical surroundings. How forceful the action of the principle of *akribeia* was, is better seen in facts relating to great people well known in the history of Byzantium. In the ninth century the patriarchal see

was twice occupied by St. Ignatius, a zealous follower of the *akribeia* of canons, a man known for his long hours of prayer, the strictness of his fasting, one who always boldly arose in defence of the church verities. At this time the Emperor Michael III was still a child, and the country was governed by a regent, the Emperor's uncle, Varda, an authoritative and influential man, of cultured mind. Yet his private life was reported to be disgraceful. Austere and zealous in observing the church canons, the Patriarch did not hesitate to speak to the mighty Varda; disregarding the indulgent motives of the *oikonomia* of human frailty, St. Ignatius turned his whole attention to the *akribeia* of canons, and, denouncing Varda, admonished him to think of his soul and to put an end to the depravity of his life. Varda did not heed him; on the day of Epiphany, in 857, he entered St. Sophia's cathedral, with other members of the imperial family, to assist at the patriarchal service and to partake of Holy Communion. The Patriarch refused to give him the sacrament and publicly announced that he was unworthy to partake of the Redeemer's Body and Blood. A great uproar arose in the cathedral. Varda raised his sword against the Patriarch. St. Ignatius admonished the mighty regent to remember the judgment of God. In the end, the great nobleman obeyed the voice of the prelate and left the cathedral, without partaking of the communion.

The Church forbade its members to marry more than three times. Yet Nicholas the Mystic, who was twice called to occupy the patriarchal see (901–907 and 912–925) had to fight for a good many years for the rehabilitation of the *akribeia* of canons, violated by the fourth marriage unlawfully contracted by the Emperor Leo VI the Wise. The Patriarch was profoundly indignant. He repeatedly appeared in the imperial palace imploring the Emperor to annul his illegal marriage. His sorrow was so great at the Emperor's thus insulting the pure Bride of Christ,

that in his eagerness he knelt down, embracing the monarch's feet. But all to no purpose. Seeing that private exhortations were useless, the Patriarch publicly denounced the Emperor, reminding him of the righteous judgment of God. He forbade the Emperor to enter the main part of the cathedral and refused him Holy Communion. Repeatedly, on the most solemn public occasions, like the great liturgic service in St. Sophia's cathedral on Christmas Day, the Patriarch personally turned the Emperor (and all his brilliant following) away from the main entrance, which led to the place which Byzantine Emperors always occupied in the cathedral, allowing the monarch to hear the service from a distant part of the building (*metatorion*). Repeatedly the Emperor was denounced, reproached, humiliated in the presence of his courtiers, his guards, and thousands of his subjects; repeatedly he was refused the sacraments. And repeatedly the Emperor obediently gave up his accustomed place in the centre and humbly stood in the *metatorion*, to the great consternation of his family and his court. At last there came a day when Leo VI the Wise of Byzantium could not stand it any longer, and Nicholas the Mystic was exiled. But the force of the church canons suffered no detriment. As to the Patriarch, exiled in 907, he knew he was persecuted for the sake of the truth, and bore everything patiently and unmurmuringly, looking forward to the day when the Emperor would submit to the demands of the Church and respect its canons. And so it came to pass. Shortly before his death (May 17, 912), Leo VI recalled Nicholas from his exile, repented and confessed his sin, asking the Patriarch to "arrange everything according to the holy canons". After five years of exile, Nicholas the Mystic once more occupied the patriarchal see; he introduced peace and harmony in Byzantium, which for a good many years before his recall was in a state of constant discontent and dis-

organization. The Council over which he presided in Constantinople (in 920) issued a decree condemning marriage for the fourth time and also instituting certain conditions for the third and even the second marriage, according to the *akribeia* of canons.

Later on, the Patriarch Polyeuctes (956–976), a great ascetic, who even as a child loved the monastic life, famous for his many virtues and sound teaching, comparable in this to the great St. John Chrysostom, arose in defence of the *akribeia* of canons against the Emperor Nicephoros Phocas. The latter, wishing for offspring to secure the throne of Byzantium to a dynasty of his name, took as his second wife the Empress Theophano, the widow of Romanos II. The wedding ceremony took place in the palace church, with great pomp, in the presence of a brilliant suite and numerous court officials. When the divine service was over, Nicephoros Phocas walked towards the altar, meaning to repeat a few additional prayers before the holy images and to kneel at the altar. But the Patriarch Polyeuctes, who also witnessed the ceremony, forbade him to come near the altar, for, according to the church canon, people marrying for the second time must undergo certain penances: praying in the church, fasting and exclusion from Holy Communion for two years. The Emperor had to obey the authority of the canons, overruled by the masterful and just commands of the Patriarch. Another time, having made himself famous by victories over the Bulgars and Arabs, the same Emperor announced to the Patriarch that it was his wish that the Church should canonize as holy martyrs all the soldiers and leaders of his army slain in these wars. But both the Patriarch and the Holy Synod opposed his wish because it contradicted the canonical law, and once more the Emperor had to submit to the will of the Patriarch. The same thing happened when later on Nicephoros tried to influence the election of provincial bishops, and the Patri-

arch Polyeuctes announced that ecclesiastical elections were not an imperial function, because the hierarchy of the Church and their election lay solely within the jurisdiction of the Patriarch and the Synod.

Among the defenders of the *akribeia* of dogmas were also the Patriarchs Antonius III Studites (974–980), Sergius II (999–1019), Alexis (1026–1043), Michael Kirularius (1043–1058), Arsenius (1255–1260 and 1261–1267), who carried on a prolonged and obstinate struggle with the Emperor Michael VIII Paleologos, for the purity and integrity of Church rules, Athanasius (1289–1293 and 1303–1311), Isidor (1347–1349), Callistos I and many other Patriarchs up to the fall of Constantinople before the besieging Turks, in 1453. Yet the flight of years did nothing to decrease the force and the importance of this principle, which, on the contrary, struck deeper roots in the minds of Byzantines, in a more distinct and definite way, penetrating deeper into the life of the masses and acquiring a wider and more efficacious influence over the nation, for the good of moral purity and the growth of spiritual interests. The moral laxity of that part of Byzantine society which tried to find its justification in the principle of *oikonomia* was firmly opposed by the upholders of the principle of *akribeia*. The whole life of the latter was an example of exalted morality; they always had a share in all the best movements of their time, and supported and preserved all that was good, and thus were a great power in building up Byzantium according to the rules and canons of the Orthodox Church.

The effort to preserve the *akribeia* of canons had yet another significant side; for the people who strove for it were also manifestly defending the inner freedom and independence of the Church. Unquestionably there were some Emperors, who, accepting in principle the mutual independence of the State and the Church, in reality violated the independence of the Church by interfering

with its interior affairs. They disregarded the fact that, by its very nature, the Church was a separate organization, with a separate authority and separate laws, because it was called to realize a purpose essentially incompatible with the activities properly belonging to the State. In the history of Byzantium we do meet with accounts of caesaro-papism in the tendencies of some Emperors, but those who think that it was a part of the general system and not merely a deviation are mistaken. It was an abuse for which individuals and not the law were responsible, an abuse condemned by their contemporaries and corrected at the first opportunity, though not always without bitter strife. The caesaro-papism of certain Byzantine Emperors attacked the independence of the Church, when, in spite of the canons of the Church, secular rulers interfered with the election of Patriarchs and bishops, desiring to find in them obedient tools, or gave their orders concerning purely ecclesiastical affairs, without having previously consulted the ecclesiastical authority. In all similar cases the adherents of the principle of *akribeia* acted in defence of the independence of the Church. They claimed that the independence of the Church was of divine institution, trying to remind the community that it was the duty of all the members of the Church, including the Emperors, to comply with the *akribeia* of canons. They held new Councils in confirmation of the freedom of the Church and the inviolability of its rights, revoking past decrees of Emperors which were in favour of caesaro-papism, etc.

These efforts on behalf of the independence of the Church were not fruitless. During the iconoclastic period the Church completely fell under the sway of the secular authority and became a mere tool of the caesaro-papism of the iconoclast Emperors, but in the ninth century all this was changed. Orthodoxy triumphed, the Church was freed from the domination of the State; once more it used its faculties as an inde-

pendent organization, and in the tenth century it reached complete independence. Harmonious interaction between the State and the Church was finally established in Byzantium and continued throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Then, for a while, it was weakened, during the temporary ascendency of Latinism in Constantinople. But in the fourteenth century it was reestablished and lasted until the final downfall of Byzantium.

In this lay the merit of the supporters of the *akribeia*: Their constant systematic efforts were directed towards keeping ever present in Byzantine minds the idea that the independence of the Church was divinely established; that the same polity must be governed by a dual power, consisting of the functions of the Patriarch and the Synod and the prerogatives of the Emperor; that the canons, as the law of the Church, were binding on all its members, independently of any other law. Thus they saved from oblivion one of the principles of the Universal Church, and by denouncing those who violated the rule of *akribeia*, and insisting on their being punished to the full extent prescribed by the canons, they not only stopped abuses, but also prevented them. The *akribeia* of the canons was always to be depended upon as a corrective in the occasional collisions between the Church and the State of Byzantium; it sustained the proper balance in the relations of these two, and gradually cleared the way for the ascendency of ecclesiastical ideas over principles of government. Rules formulated by the Seven Ecumenical Councils and by some of the Local Councils as well had equal power with the laws of the State. More than this, it was legally established that the pragmatic sanctions of Emperors had no legal power if they contradicted the rules of the Church, the latter being more important than the civil law, because the holy Fathers having formulated them and the Emperors having affirmed that their power was

equal to the power of the civil laws, they must be accepted as Holy Writ; whereas the State laws were formulated by the Emperors alone (the *nomocanon* of Patriarch Photius, and the *syntagma* of Matthew Vlastares).

This result of complying with the *akribeia* of canons proves that not only did Byzantium preserve the judicial principles of the Ecumenical Church, but that even the social life of Byzantium grew to be churchlike, under the protection of the Orthodox Church, free in its inner life and independent in its order. The influence of the *akribeia* of canons also showed itself in the preservation of ancient principles and forms, which was manifest in the attitude of the Byzantine Church towards the Roman. Ever since the ninth century Rome had been trying to win over the Church of Byzantium. But the idea of the supremacy of a Pope was altogether alien to the ruling canonical principles of the Universal Church. The Church of the East, unlike the Church of the West, had evolved the system of *pentarchy* in the supreme government of the Universal Church, according to which five Patriarchs, equal in dignity and in honour, should govern it. These Patriarchs had their sees in Rome, in Constantinople, in Alexandria, in Antioch, and in Jerusalem. And every time the Popes claimed supremacy in the Universal Church, the adherents of the canonical *akribeia* opposed them most energetically, justifying their protest by the universally accepted rule of the patriarchal pentarchy. Attempts to establish a union between the two halves of Christendom also failed for the same reason, during the last four centuries of Byzantium's existence, there being both dogmatic and canonical obstacles in the way.

Rejecting the supremacy of the Pope on the ground of the patriarchal pentarchy, Byzantium brought into juxtaposition the absolutism of the papal idea and the organic combination of the personal rule of the Patriarch

and the collective rule of the Synod and extraordinary councils. The principle of the collective government of the Church possessed Byzantine minds only the more firmly because the other three Eastern Patriarchs took part in the sessions of the Byzantine Synod, not to mention the more general Councils. Owing to unfortunate political conditions and the oppression of the Mussulman conquerors in the East, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were forced to reside a good part of their time in Constantinople, trying to do their best for their own patriarchates from a distance. It would seem that the long centuries of the Mussulman occupation of Egypt, Syria and the Holy Land, and the deplorable material conditions of the local Orthodox Churches might have justified the abolition of the autocephalous government in their respective patriarchates. Yet neither their dignity nor their autocephalous rule suffered detriment from any interference of the mighty Patriarchs of Constantinople, for the simple reason that at no time did the latter manifest any desire for supremacy, as the very essence of their own power made any domineering inclination impossible in them. They simply held themselves always ready to offer their brotherly assistance to the other Eastern Patriarchates in their dire need and distress. This clearly demonstrates Byzantium's fidelity to the original principles of the ecumenical ecclesiastical order and rule, by which the Church of Byzantium was also guided in its opposition to the Church of Rome. As to any pretensions on the part of the Patriarchs of Byzantium to secular influence, they were entirely out of the question as long as the dual power ruled Byzantium, in the persons of the Emperor and the Patriarch.

Lastly, the *akribeia* of canons in the Byzantine Church resulted in the exact preservation of the fundamental codex of rules, formed during the period of the Ecumenical Councils. Completely obedient to the dogmatic decrees

of the Councils of the Universal Church, Byzantium likewise never deviated canonically from the rules of the holy Apostles, the Councils and the Fathers, developing its further legislation in perfect harmony with this foundation, suffering no ancient church rule to be either abolished or changed, and never mistaking more recent ecclesiastical legislation for the code of the Universal Church. Owing to this, both the canonical order and the life of the Church in Byzantium were organically descended from the canonical order and the ecclesiastical life of the early Christians, so that in essence and in form they were very close to the true original Christianity in its authentic integrity or, in other words, they were very close to Universal Orthodoxy.

IV

Orthodoxy is life in Christian grace, mysterious communion with God in Christ, renovation in grace through the Holy Ghost in company with other believers, when by making their faith one with the Son of God, they also become in Him children of their Father in Heaven and brothers among themselves.[7] But before they attain complete union with God, Christians need some special mode of life to bring them nearer to God. And the Eastern Church evolved, on the ground of the fundamental demands of Orthodoxy, a *special system of the spiritual ascent of man to God*, which, in the region of ethics, also represents a characteristic peculiarity of the Byzantine ecclesiastical world view.

In Byzantium the ideal of moral perfection was preeminently ascetic and harmonious with the *akribeia* both of dogmas and of canons. On the other hand, as a means for moral perfection, asceticism was demanded from both monks and ordinary people. Asceticism was regarded as a common duty which could be practised

[7]Prof. Nicholas N. Glubokovsky, "Orthodoxy in Its Essence," THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, June, 1913.

in the very different surroundings of the monastic and the worldly life. It consisted of the constant careful cultivation of one's spiritual self, unswerving effort and labour for the attainment of moral perfection. It is a constant ascent towards spiritual perfection, by the practice of Christian virtues and the struggle against worldly obstacles on the way to salvation. The laymen's life also must be filled with many labours, austerities, and privations, and must be dedicated to works of Christian goodness. Consequently in Byzantium private family life as well as social life was permeated with religion; the whole community was in constant intimate intercourse with the Orthodox Church. Living in the salutary shelter of consecrating divine services and guided by the parish clergy and the monks, Byzantium formed, as it were, one huge monastery. According to the prevailing ideal, Byzantine laymen must make themselves perfect in the same virtues which adorned the monastic life: piety, obedience to church statutes, attendance at divine services, the reading of the Holy Scriptures and the study of the works of the holy Fathers, respect for clergy and monks, and the practice of Christian virtues, especially charity which pre-eminently helps the soul to grow wings. There were special public *Te Deums* in case of earthquakes, famines, wars, laying the foundation-stones of new houses and moving into them, sowing and reaping, laying down the keels of ships and launching them, etc. The Byzantines considered that consecration and the Church's blessing were necessary for the success of every enterprise. Many literary works bear witness to this. One of them is in the form of a father's instruction to his son, both of whom belonged to the aristocracy of Byzantium. This makes only the more interesting the gist of the instruction stating that life in the world is uninterrupted work and struggle, yet that it would not be wise to be carried away by excessive labour and worldly preoccupations:

"Watch that you do no harm to your soul," instructs the father; "do not forget God, neglecting the divine services performed by *Orthodox laymen*, namely matins, the prayer at four o'clock, evening service, and that which follows it. These prayers exist for the purpose of strengthening our life; by them we are known to be the servants of God.

"When it is possible, attend to your midnight worship and read at least one psalm, then give yourself to rest. Truly this is no labour, for it is a great delight to commune with God when you are alone.

"In your prosperity, O my son, remember him who suffered for you. He who forgets this, forgets God. Remember that neither happiness nor sorrow lasts for ever, and in spending your day, show what you are. Whether you do good or evil, it will not be forgotten, but will remain in the sight of the Lord for retribution.

"If any man ask alms of you, give readily and immediately. If he is your friend, thank God for having been able to serve him with your hand; if he is your enemy, let him also have what he asks of you; if he is a stranger, consider him to be Christ, and thank him.

"If you wish to give alms, give at any hour, morning, noon, and night. Have no appointed time to give alms: give as soon as you think of it. If you delay, the devil will conquer you. Do not forget your relations, and God shall repay you.

"Talk to monks frequently; and if you find they have no learning, do not condemn them. God's apostles, though uneducated, gave light to the world.

"When you are free from your duties as a military leader, read both historical and theological books. Do not say: How does a warrior profit from dogmas and church books? On the contrary, you shall greatly profit. . . . Read much and you will learn much. If you do not understand, do not be discouraged. Read the same book more than once, and God will grant you understanding and you will understand.

"Study Holy Scripture, as the Lord commands, but do not make it the object of idle curiosity.

"If, holding a sacred book in your hand, you read, and somebody comes to see you, close the book and converse with your visitor. . . . But when you are alone, whenever it is possible, let some book occupy you.

"Carry no talisman on your person, except a cross, or a holy image, or some holy relic.

"I wish you to love all people.

"Let acts of kindness towards friends and enemies alike be your aspiration. . . . Not only the deeds but the thoughts of men stand before the eyes of the Lord. Let your mind aspire to goodness and God will grant what is good to you."[8]

So exalted were the moral views of a Byzantine magnate, who taught his son the incessant cultivation of

[8] *Cecaumeni Strategicon, et incerti scriptoris De officiis regiis libellus.* Ediderunt B. Wassilevsky et V. Iernstedt. Petropoli, 1896.

his soul, in the midst of the labours and cares of a worldly life. These were no demands of copybook morals, but the instructions and precepts of a life permeated with the principles of ecclesiasticism, the fervent advice of a faithful member of the Orthodox Church. The authenticity of these particular instructions is proved by a whole series of similar documents and the historical records of concrete real lives which distinctly characterize the Byzantines of the Middle Ages as men who, by heredity and the various influences of their surroundings, owed their moral and religious stability to their Orthodox ecclesiasticism and ascetic practices.

In Byzantium habits of asceticism were shared by laymen and monks in their incessant toil and striving after moral perfection. But the monasticism of Byzantium, seeking to come nearer to God, evolved a finer and loftier system of attainment which was accessible only to the more spiritually experienced ascetics. In the Middle Ages, the chief hearth of Eastern monasticism was the holy Mount Athos, which is still the guardian of the true church tradition and Christian enlightenment. This invincible stronghold of Orthodoxy saw the birth and development of a peculiar ascetical attitude towards the world, at the centre of which lay the doctrine of *hesukhia* or silence. *Hesukhia* was the creative power which built up Byzantine monasticism, and the inevitable conclusion from the dogmatic data of Orthodoxy, in which ascetic motives and the traditional universal *akribeia* of the East were harmoniously blended. The roots of *hesukhia* are to be looked for in the depths of the world concepts of ancient Eastern anchorites, but in the mediaeval period it reached a more perfect form, having been verified and given the testimonial of monastic experiences in the attainment of perfection during many centuries. Ideas connected with it had acquired more depth and the detailed explanation of traditional foundations had grown broader. These foun-

dations could be traced to the primitive Eastern *askesis* (rules of asceticism). So that in the *hesukhia* also we can easily trace the characteristic idea of Byzantine Orthodoxy, that of connection and union with the earliest foundations of Christianity.

The dwellers in monasteries believed that our present life is the gift of God's mercy and longsuffering. The object of life is to return to God through repentance, to be united to Him, to become His children. He who does not use his life to do penance, himself signs the death warrant of his soul, for it is death to be removed and estranged from God and His Grace. But the soul reaches perfection with the participation of the body. These two do penance together in this vale of tears and death. Conversion to God consists, first of all, in removing everything which does not help the bearing of spiritual fruit. Such are: wealth, glory, harmful sights, passions, and all transitory things in general. The complete rejection of worldly cares and longings, being dead to the world and completely devoted to God, are the first steps necessary to prepare oneself for the training of the *hesukhia*, which, properly speaking, is the renunciation of every thought of anxiety, detachment from all exterior things, disregard of the flesh and the world. In other words, *hesukhia* is the constant service of God and standing before Him, and a *hesukhast* is he who converses with God alone and constantly prays to Him.

Hesukhia was achieved by the spiritual ascent of a series of grades. The first of them was the grade of *beginners*, who endeavoured to free themselves from various passions. Thus by giving up the desire of possessions and the love of money, which is the root of all evil, by giving up ambition, servility and gluttony, the *hesukhast* deliberately dedicated himself to the spirit of poverty. His cell was a haven of chastity. When poverty of spirit was attained, it produced contrition, and

contrition of the soul prepared him for self-condemnation, which was followed by consolation. Then came the turn of teaching the mind concentration and turning towards the inner man, by means of recollection and warding off distracting thoughts. The second grade of the training of *hesukhia* came when by careful discipline the *hesukhast* formed the habit of concentrating his mind on divine things. This was the grade of the *progressing*, who devoted themselves to the singing of psalms. The *hesukhast* reached the third grade of his training, the grade of the *successful*, only through complete isolation and silence, controlling his heart and sobering his mind, incessant repentance and tears, incessant thinking of God and of the approaching hour of death, the singing of psalms, and praying, "Lord Jesus Christ have mercy on me; Son of God, save me!"

In the language of the Byzantine ascetics these three grades were named *praxis*, or exercising, through which they were raised to the loftier grade of *theoria* or contemplation, opened only to the perfect *hesukhasts*. In this state of contemplation the soul of the *hesukhast*, purified and elevated, was resurrected; it came so near God that the grace and the divine light of the Holy Ghost illumined it from above. In the teaching of St. Gregory of Mount Sinai, this was the resurrection of the soul before the general resurrection, when the soul beheld truth and was illumined by the light of grace. In the teaching of St. Gregory Palama, having reached the grade of *contemplation*, the *hesukhast* was mystically united with God. This was the *theosis*, or becoming *like unto God*, a state in which the soul attains divine illumination, beholding the uncreated hypostatic light—*enupostaton*, which is the glory of the being of God, the radiance granted and communicated by the Eternal to those who deserve it. But the *hesukhast* could reach union with God and recognize the supreme truth only through the action of divine grace. Only then was the per-

fect *hesukhast* capable of contemplating the divine radiance, which shone around the Lord on Mount Thabor and which His disciples were able to see. The light of Mount Thabor shining on Byzantine Mount Athos was the ultimate goal of the *hesukhia* training of ascetics. It was the completion of the long and laborious mystical ascent towards God; the supreme ideal of the mediaeval monks of Byzantium, in which was realized the ineffable spiritual joy and bliss not of this world.

But the way of the *hesukhia* practice was accessible to but very few ascetics. In the higher degrees it was undertaken only by the monks of Mount Athos or Mount Sinai. But in most Byzantine monasteries ascetic training took place within the first grades of the *hesukhia.* But even in this stage Byzantine asceticism was founded on the renunciation of the world for the *love of God,* whereas, in the case of laymen, asceticism was based on living virtuously in the world for the *love of mankind.* In this harmonious combination asceticism was developed in a many-sided way, its lay character taking on its fina shape before the end of the thirteenth century, after which its manifestations became more austere, chiefly in the lives of anchorites.[9]

As to the social activity of monks, it also was developed in strict harmony with the tradition of Orthodoxy. The *akribeia* once more lay at its foundation both with regard to doctrine and the application of church canons. Whether the monks remained in the secular world as teachers of Christian faith and morality by example, admonition and precept; whether they denounced the vices and errors of the time, or defended the oppressed and persecuted; whether they worked as missionaries within and without the Empire, or founded schools for the people; whether they directed works of charity and

[9]A more detailed account of the *Hesukhia* is to be found in Professor Sokoloff's book on *St. Gregory Palama, Archbishop of Thessalonica, His Works and the Doctrine of Hesukhia,* Petrograd, 1914.

rest-houses for pilgrims, or served their community as confessors, Bishops and Patriarchs, their activity invariably brought forward the rule of the *akribeia* of the Church. They preached the verities of the Universal Church and preserved the sacred traditions of Orthodoxy, in direct succession from the faith of the Apostles and the holy Fathers.

V

Lastly, as a distinct feature of Byzantium, Orthodoxy evolved the living organization and brotherly alliance of a whole group of autocephalous Orthodox Churches. The Church of Constantinople stood first among them. Yet this was the superiority of honour and not of power. On the basis of ecumenical dogmas and canons, in spite of all its advantages, the Church of Constantinople never attempted to spread its rule over other Eastern Churches, though their common history offered many an occasion when this could have been done. But the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and even of Cyprus, kept the self-governing dignity, which was granted to them in the epoch of Ecumenical Councils. Yet, though independent of each other, the Eastern Churches remained in the closest intercommunion and are now in reality a single living organism. The principle that binds them together is Universal Orthodoxy, which means the sharing of dogmas and the canonical code, each Church keeping its autocephalous dignity, yet preserving its unbroken brotherly union with the others, all attending together to problems common to all, without the deterioration or repression of the independence of any. This organization of local Churches exists in the Orthodox East, whereas in the Latin West the mutual relation of Churches is entirely different, the independence of all being sacrificed to the system of the absolutism of Rome. More than this, having established its position in history as the zealous and faithful guardian of Orthodoxy, Byzan-

tium transmitted its most sacred national heritage to the neighbouring countries, brought into contact with them by a common civilization. Its missionary work was tremendous; it brought the Gospel to half of Europe and a good part of Asia. In its missionary activity Byzantium showed much gentleness towards the peoples it was evangelizing, a wise discrimination in its method, and a motherly solicitude with regard to its new spiritual children. The missionaries of Byzantium made their conversions by demonstrating truth in a clear, open way, by confessing Apostolic Ecumenical Orthodoxy, calling people most lovingly into communion with Christ and His Holy Church. But as soon as the newly formed church communities were mature enough they were granted autonomy; and, made one with the others by their common Orthodoxy, they came into union with the Eastern Apostolic Churches, as their spiritual sisters, as the spiritual children of the One Orthodox Eastern Catholic Church.

The Russian Church is one of the many Orthodox Churches of the East which received their Christianity from Byzantium. This most precious inheritance of Russia is incalculable in its inner wealth; in it the Russian people possess a priceless treasure of overflowing riches. This treasure is holy Orthodoxy, "the faith of the Apostles and the Fathers which maintains the world." There is not, and there cannot be, any spiritual possession equal to this. In it repose the fulness and precision of dogmatic truth and canonical self-definition, the first foundation of moral perfection and the pledge of the fulness of spiritual achievement. In it is the source of regeneration and renovation, and the testimonial of the spiritual bond with the Universal Church and of union with the Lord Jesus Christ.

Those who say that the system of *akribeia* puts chains on the life of the Church and brings it into stagnation are unjust. The *akribeia* of dogmas cannot be reproached

with this in the very nature of it; and according to the legislation of Byzantium the *akribeia* of canons does not prevent the activity of the creative faculty, as long as it rests on ecumenical bases, whose eternal boundaries were established by the holy Fathers. On the other hand, slackness and compromise never lead to normal progress; neither do they by any means guarantee that the use of the creative faculty as such will turn to the true problems of the church community. Moreover, *akribeia* affords boundless room for the moral perfection of individuals and communities. In this direction Byzantium established an ideal, the attainment of which requires sustained effort and calls for the most subtle and complicated spiritual process which leads to the state of mystical contemplation.

When St. Gregory Palama was a youth, beginning his *hesukhia* training, he beheld in a vision St. John the Divine, who, smiling in the gentlest way, asked why he always began his incessant prayers to the Holy Virgin by asking for "light in his darkness." St. Gregory answered that light was what he needed above all to see and to fulfil the will of God. St. Gregory's constant exhortation to his numerous followers and disciples also was: "On to the light, on to the light!" The greatest endeavour of this saint was his preaching the spiritual upbuilding of life on the basis of Universal Orthodoxy and fighting the things of earth and the wish to compromise with them. Having attained the end of his life's arduous labour, St. Gregory once more commanded: "On to the celestial abode!"

Such is the legacy of Orthodox Byzantium.

The Present Theological Crisis in the Church of Norway

By S. Michelet, D.D.,

Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Christiania.

During the nineteenth century Norway has had a surprisingly rich and rapid development in almost every respect, continuing under more favourable conditions, be it granted, upon foundations laid in the preceding period. The religious effects of the Reformation, by reason of political, social and other difficulties, had penetrated very slowly to the common people in the evangelical churches of central Europe and of the North,—somewhat more rapidly, on the whole, in the smaller, comparatively freer, northern countries than in Germany. The beginning of the nineteenth century witnessed among us the first great revival movement, inaugurated by a farmer lad, H. N. Hauge, and spreading chiefly among the broader strata of the people, farmers, artisans, small merchants and the like.

After the difficult and trying decades, in which the year 1814 stands out most prominently, we experienced in the thirties and forties a cultural and spiritual springtime, affecting religion and theology almost contemporaneously with other higher interests. The names of two young professors in theology at the University of Norway are most conspicuous, the one Gisle Johnson, and the other C. P. Caspari, who was called to his post from Germany. Johnson was active in revival preaching and,

together with theological students and divines influenced by him, brought about a powerful revival in our country during the fifties and sixties. Men of theological training, in and out of orders, took up revivalistic work and even recognized the right and the duty of undisciplined laymen to preach the word of God (at any rate when spiritual need demanded such service); this was something new in our Norwegian State Church. The end and aim was to save souls; conversion and regeneration were of first importance, while sanctification received less emphasis. Those upon whom the Spirit had breathed felt themselves, as brethren and sisters in the Lord, closely knit together and naturally formed smaller circles in Pietist fashion. The testimony of these witnesses was the fullest and strongest that our country had yet heard. If I should speak of the one-sidedness of the movement, it consisted first and foremost in a tendency to limit the object of the regenerated life to a repeated proving of one's self in regard to the reality of the new birth, to labouring for the salvation of others and to abstention from certain things strictly forbidden, such as dancing, card-playing, secular music, the theatre and, on the whole, from the enjoyments and even the cultural pursuits of the world. As a self-evident consequence this pietistic movement—which at the same time was strictly conservative and confessional, and closely connected with contemporary conservative German theology (the schools of Erlangen and Hengstenberg)—saw but darkly that all culture, the whole of human life, is subject to the Kingdom of God and is predetermined to be interpenetrated in all its phases by Christian faith and morality.

The movement was victorious by its vital, truly pious spirituality. Instead of the older conception of Christianity, more passive and dependent upon authority, it established conscious personal religion and individual service in the winning of souls, and created all sorts of activities in home and foreign missions. In one par-

ticular its work took the shape of national reform, namely in the organization of the church. The administration of our church was, and still is, closely connected with that of other national affairs. It is under the direction of government and Storthing; ecclesiastical legislation is voted by the Storthing, and church administration is in the hands of a department of state, the Church department, whose president has jurisdiction also over the department of Education. The clergy are appointed by the King. Naturally enough the pietistic following found such a state-church administration too broad, too worldly, too clerical. They demanded a reorganization of the church according to pietist ideals with a synodical form and strict discipline, so that those of true Christian life and profession should have a determining influence upon church affairs.

This pietistic revival has been an immeasurable and lasting blessing to our church. But it has also caused the church of Norway to be more distinctly isolated from contemporary influences of thought and culture than any other national church, heir to the Reformation, with the possible exception of the church of Finland. And this was all the more fateful since at the same time the nation, far from being stationary or isolated, was making most rapid progress in almost every respect. As the Norwegian people, sea-farers from of old, had by reason of close contact with the outer world remained open to influences from all foreign lands, so during this period of expansion they were receptive to an unusual degree. As a result, the pietistic Christianity, strong, personal, but intellectually exclusive as it was, became in an unfortunate measure the Christianity of the lower middle classes. Among the more progressive and intellectual there developed, slowly but inevitably, a new non-Christian culture. Its motto was liberal parliamentarianism—strong, because nationalistic in opposition to a royalty resident in Sweden—Darwinism and Positivism, literary-

artistic realism, naturalism and impressionism; to which, in the seventies and eighties, a "free-thinking" denial of Christianity allied itself, involving criticism of the life of the church as mainly superstitious and hypocritical. The impulses to this new intellectual tendency had come principally from England and France; but even ideas which in England had in part immediately been deepened and consecrated by Christian thought had, under Norwegian church conditions, the effect of a revolutionary attack upon Christianity itself.

The peril was all the greater because the revivalistic movement was simultaneously losing its power. Revivals, more particularly such as take strong hold upon the feelings, have admittedly a tendency to reach a climax within a limited number of years and subsequently to diminish gradually in strength.

But Christianity, by reason of our earlier history and even more by reason of the strong influence of the later revival, had too firm a hold upon our people to be annihilated by the free-thinking tendency among the intellectuals. Moreover, during the spiritual crisis there arose a new theology, conservative but at the same time hospitable to impressions from without; its representative man was Professor Fredrik Petersen. In his lecture delivered in 1880: *How shall our church meet the unbelief of the day?* he outlined the religious perils of the situation, and proposed as an objective: the re-thinking of the thoughts of today in accordance with the spirit of Christianity. His motto, firm faith and liberal research, gained acceptation among the younger theologians. Meanwhile strong and beneficial influences from the Anglo-Saxon world had flowed in upon our church, and contributed in saving it from the unfortunate dilemma which the connection with Lutheran Germany appeared to threaten: on the one hand, piety joined with confessional conservatism, on the other, liberalism, marked by a critically negative attitude.

Concerning our relation to the Anglo-Saxon churches I should perhaps be more explicit. Men like Farrar and Henry Drummond, Moody and F. B. Meyer, John R. Mott and General Booth have been of no small significance in our Norwegian church.

One might suppose that the very large emigration to the United States would have been of singularly great influence in the transference of energy from the Anglo-Saxon world to our country. This, however, just in regard to religion, has not been the case. For our emigrant farmers had particular reason in a strange community to cling devotedly not only to their memories of the life of the fathers in the old country, but in an especial degree to that which was the very heart's blood of that life: the Evangelical-Lutheran ritual and the Evangelical-Lutheran faith. Thus the emigrant churches in the United States have remained confessionally even more conservative than the church of the mother country.

But our sea-faring men have brought home many spiritual impulses, so that Methodist and Baptist congregations have grown up in various parts of our country which, by propaganda among the broader classes, have in more than one respect had a stimulating influence upon our national church.

Our seamen's mission, established in 1864, has sent forth a corps of young, energetic clergymen to the various ports touched by the greater number of our sailors, chiefly to Great Britain and the United States, thus bringing these workers into personal contact with Christian life abroad.

In course of time, moreover, our church received from the Anglo-Saxon countries a series of impressions and valuable practical incitements which gradually changed the hereditary view of the "Calvinistic" church. The opinion no longer prevailed that they had "another spirit," nor even that they had an inferior form of Christianity. For not only had our people seen the powerful

and blessed work of the spirit of God in the Anglo-Saxon Calvinistic churches, but they had received from these churches fructifying impulses. Through closer study the conviction took root that the old categories, Lutheran and Calvinist, but imperfectly corresponded to the realities of the present. The various churches of the Reformation are in fact now more sharply distinguished by their varying history subsequent to the Reformation, and in a still higher degree by the national characteristics to which they give expression, than by the ancient lines of demarcation of the Reformation age. Thus a greater divergence is felt between the British and the German form of Christianity—whether the latter be Calvinistic or Lutheran—than between the Calvinistic and Lutheran elements in Germany. And while we Norwegians devotedly and sincerely hold to our Lutheran type of Christianity, not only as inherited from the fathers, but as giving the best expression to eternal and inalienable truths and as fitting the behoofs of national individuality, we have learned to respect highly the potent spirituality of the Anglo-Saxon churches and to keep an open door for the impulses they can give us; and all this without a fear of losing anything properly our own, but on the contrary with the conviction of distinct gain toward a type of Christianity more vital, more nationally Norse than we could hope to attain by timorous isolation.

With the other means of communication from Anglo-Saxon Christendom particular mention must be made of the World's Student Christian Federation, which during the last twenty years has been directly and indirectly of great advantage to us.

On the whole, spiritual contact at present may be said to be almost equally close in two directions, with German Christendom to the south and with Anglo-Saxon to the west. Influences from one side supply remarkably well what we feel to be the deficiencies and limitations in the influences from the other. We feel bound in close

spiritual relationship to both the great Germanic and evangelical peoples and their churches, different as we are from both, but nearer in spirit to each of them than they are to one another. And nowhere else can the fearful war between England and Germany, with its fearful concomitant, mutual misjudgment, have caused deeper sorrow than in our small church of Norway.

After this digression we return to the presentation of the internal development of the Norwegian church since the year 1880. In the eighties various forces within and without changed, particularly among the younger generation, the older attitude of the church—strictly confessional and inhospitable toward new ideas—into one less severe and more spacious in its outlook.

In consequence of the victory of parliamentarian opposition over the crown in 1884, whereby the government became parliamentary in character—which under Norwegian conditions means complete democratic rule—the conservatives in the church transferred their support to those who were working for a synodical church organization, not with the intention of democratizing the church administration but to save it from democratization, conservative clergy and pietistic laity being alike convinced that the movement toward parliamentarianism and the sovereignty of the people was unchristian and destructive to the church. But when this attempt failed, the clergy, particularly the younger element, accommodated themselves with surprising rapidity to the new democratic conditions. And the activity toward synodical organization soon declined.

But before long new problems presented themselves which, during the last ten or twelve years, have greatly agitated our church.

The struggle between the older and newer theology which arose in 1880 had, particularly by reason of the piety and moderation of Professor Petersen's personality, not yet developed into a decided crisis; nor, therefore,

had it attained full clarity. But there existed an uncertain spiritual suspense, an increasing anxiety and suspicion among the conservative theologians and among the lay people who held to the ancient traditions; a multitude of rumours had fearful things to tell of dangerous, unchristian elements in the views of Professor Petersen and his followers. Still the majority anticipated a tranquil theological development, though in reality only by an exceptional dispensation could our church have passed through the unusually great revolution of thought from the position of Caspari and Johnson to modern theological thinking without a serious crisis and catastrophe.

During the period between 1892 and 1894 nearly all the members of our theological faculty were, in God's mysterious providence, summoned away by other duties or by death, among them the two veterans, Caspari and Gisle Johnson. And new men were appointed to the faculty who did not occupy the standpoint of the Erlangen theology or lean to the tendencies represented by Hengstenberg. The highly respected Bishop J. C. Heuch sent forth in 1902 a sharp warning and polemic against the new theology, and during several years of controversy the differences became increasingly marked and acute. Great importance in the controversy attached to a struggle between "church" and "theology" in regard to supplying a vacant professorship in systematic theology and ethics; it resolved itself into a question whether scholarly attainment or confessional conservatism should determine the appointment. The government decided the contest by appointing successively the candidate most strongly recommended by each of the two opposing factions (1905–06); but this was far from satisfying the conservative majority in the church, who had occupied a position nearly despotic during the controversy, inasmuch as almost all ecclesiastical and religious corporations by petition and the like had supported their side. These contentions brought with them a further sharp-

ening of contrasts, so that all the theological problems with which churches abroad had struggled for half a century, but which Norwegian theology had hitherto excluded from religious consideration, were thrown all at once open to debate in our church. Unprepared as we were, this condition proved most disquieting and spiritually confusing. Special significance attached to a controversy relating to the external actuality of the resurrection of Christ and to the Virgin birth; the average believer drew from this the inference that nothing, not even faith in the divinity of Christ, remained unshaken to the new theology. A private theological faculty was established in 1907 by a very liberal popular subscription, and in 1913 it was granted the right of examination of clerical candidates on the same basis as the theological faculty of the university.

For the third time impetus was now given to labours looking toward a synodical organization—this time particularly furthered by a desire to secure the conservative biblical and confessional character of the church which, in the opinion of many, the constituted authorities had neglected to defend. Attention was directed to the presence of dissenters and atheists in the Storthing. Attention was further called to the fact that Norway was almost the only evangelical country in which the church had no independence over against the state, that, for example, its clergy was appointed by the King, and its service, its liturgy and the like were determined by the King; it was considered inconsistent with the dignity of the church to remain under state direction.

At first the controversy brought about a stimulation of general interest in religious questions. The new tendency received vigorous support from such as felt themselves opposed to the reigning orthodoxy within the church and interested in sustaining the right of liberal research. As the struggle continued in its course, however, and it became evident that the differences between

the two theological tendencies were not by far so fundamental as they had been made to appear in the acuteness of polemical controversy, the irreligious and the radical religious circles lost interest in the contention. And general interest in religion even sank so far below the plane it had previously occupied that from various quarters complaints began to be heard of diminishing attendance at church. It seems as if the exhaustion of so much strength in polemics has to some extent paralyzed the positive constructive energies of the church and resulted in a measure of debility which might become threatening, had we not reason to believe that it is merely transitory.

This ecclesiastical polemic against the modern ideas has not, on the other hand, in any noticeable degree prevented their dissemination among the people in general. For in many instances it has gone quite counter to its purpose: ingenuous believers, who previously have come in contact only with conservative testimonies, hear terrifying descriptions of fearful heresies which, according to the testifier, prevail in the present day, and are in part thereby thrown into disquietude and uncertainty or find affinities for solitary thoughts of their own, which before they had hardly dared to recognize. If they discover, furthermore, that the designated heretics are in fact sincere Christians and not so black as they are painted, such a discovery has a very marked influence upon their point of view. At times I fear that the thinking laity of our church, as a direct result of the controversy, may proceed not too slowly, but on the contrary too rapidly, in putting away the old and following after the new, while still radical and immature; for a revolutionary break with the ancient order must inevitably result in spiritual loss, a slow and quiet development being far preferable. In the circles best known to me among the members of the church, however, namely the young men who are preparing themselves for the ministry, the

danger of revolutionary radicalism is in the main, as I hope, already averted. The practical life force of Christianity, as it presented itself before them in the Christian Students' Movement, has had a determining influence toward preserving them from youthful radicalism and the disease of negative criticism, and has taught them to build up by the power of the divine spirit rather than to tear down. The Christian Students' Movement, in this spiritual crisis of ours, has been of most decisive significance for the whole future of our church.

The issue of the crisis it is still too early to foretell. Certain signs seem to indicate nevertheless that even now the sharpness of theological antitheses has begun to be modified. The glory must be given to God and to our pious fathers, who have endowed us with the patrimony of a vital Christianity enriched with spiritual grace, which to such an extent transfuses conservative and liberal alike, that—consciously or unconsciously—they are bound together in the unity of the spirit. In a measure this safeguards the representatives of both tendencies against extreme radical limitations; and above all it safeguards both parties against the prevalence of purely negative and unfruitful destructiveness. Within a few years I hope that sympathy and co-operation will be re-established in our church, though it may take a long time before the present spiritual crisis will be wholly overpast. That which seems to me to remain the great theoretical and practical difficulty, which will long separate large elements of our very best laity from the new theology, is the difficulty of uniting historical, critical understanding of the Holy Bible with that immediate, vital relation to the word which is indispensable to a healthy, energetic spiritual life. In this matter theoretical meditations alone will not lead to the goal; a new life habit is an absolute requirement.

The movement toward the separation of church and state seems to me to be already ebbing. Many have

come to fear a change so radical. And for this reason they desire a more gradual reform: for the time being only an organization of individual congregations is to be contemplated, with the establishment of local church councils which, among other things, shall have influence upon the appointment of the clergy; and a further tranquil constructive development is to proceed upon this basis. The consideration also presents itself to them with some force that a separation of church and state might easily lead to the shouldering of Christianity from the position it now holds in the life of the nation. Particular thought, too, has been turned to the matter of religious instruction in our state schools; whether or not there is a danger that in such an event our schools might become irreligious or receive instruction merely interdenominational or confined to morality, while actual indoctrination in the faith of the church would be divorced from the school and relegated to the separate maintenance of the church.

But at the bottom of these considerations, in my opinion, lies a conscious or unconscious feeling that in reality, under the conditions that prevail among us, a state church is no bad external agency for the work of the divine spirit among our people. For Norway has the considerable advantage over the greater number of other Christian countries that its people are united in a single church organization, dissenters being in number merely an insignificant minority (62,553 in all), and avowed irreligion having no appreciable strength within the nation. So long as this remains the case the members of our Storthing and our government will always heed the just demands of the church to the extent that these demands have the sanction of the electorate. The activities of the church in home and foreign missions and in humanitarian work are now principally organized in the form of free private associations. And these carry on their labours under state-church conditions with com-

plete independence; to some extent they are apprehensive that a synodical, more hierarchical organization would in a measure render these unfettered activities institutional and thus diminish their freedom of action. And those who look beyond the pietistic ideal of saving individual souls and gathering them into "the little fold" while the great world remains subject to evil, those who see as the prime object the permeation of the entire being of the nation by Christianity, the reclamation of the whole people to be the people of God, consider that their purpose may be better fulfilled by making the entire nationality replete with the spirit of God and by making our government more and more a Christian government, than by sundering this unity into two distinct sections, the one secular-political and the other religious. From this point of view there is quite general agreement as to the necessity of giving the local congregations ecclesiastical autonomy and influence over against the central administration; for thereby initiative and independence of action are furthered.

For the same reason the purely ecclesiastical affairs of the congregation should be under direction of a local church council and should not be relegated to the county board, which has such a variety of concerns to administer that it quite certainly must neglect the concerns of the church. At the same time it is essential that no unnecessary separation be made between the congregational authorities and the national administration in other respects, but that church and state be inseparably united also in externals to the extent that this result, in accordance with our history, may be attained without injury, but on the contrary with advantage, to both. The partisans of synodical organization contend that it would result in a stronger central administration and a solider, more homogeneous church. From the opposite side the objection is raised that such external solidity and uniformity involves not only strength but weakness as well.

The religious, psychological consciousness of our age has clearly demonstrated that the spirit of God works in many ways, and shapes many varying types, each of which has a divine right. It would therefore be a shackling of the free action of the spirit if we should attempt to force all these types into conformity after the old orthodox fashion and to bind them beneath the same ecclesiastical forms and confessions,—or by such an attempted conformation split them into separate church organizations and thus break the unity of the spirit. And a democratically governed state church is actually better fitted than any other type of church to provide that spaciousness, that consideration for the minority, which can serve all and unite all. Really vital unity can in any event never be external, but must be internal: the unity of the spirit of God, which worketh all in all, so that only that which is of the spirit lives and is given increase, while that which loses the divine spirit sickens and perishes.

Certain of the lessons which the crisis has taught us deserve to be mentioned at the close:

It is a perilous thing, when a church excludes itself for a length of time from continuous spiritual contact with the progress of the age in other lands. This but too readily leads at length to a collapse, when such isolation can no longer be maintained and all the new ideas at once throng in upon the church. Under such circumstances ideas, which in essence are not at enmity with Christianity, will easily press on toward anti-Christian confusion; even more, ideas which at bottom are of a pronounced Christian character may, in such a situation, borne aloft in a spirit of opposition by irreligious heralds, serve a profane purpose in the circumscription of the domain of religion,—until believers gain time for thorough reflection upon the new ideas, and thus make them auxiliaries of a Christian conception of life.

The victory in such a conflict of ideas is to be gained

not so much by intellectual polemics—although truth inevitably gains through clarification—as by genuine holy living. Intellectual polemic, for the defenders of conservatism particularly, is a two-edged sword, which hews down the old confident authoritarian faith quite as much as it hews down its modern opponents. But above all, it is not to be dissociated from the perilous risk of weakening the constructive and creative energies of the church in withdrawing invaluable forces and interests to the service of a strife which, however inevitable, is at all events unproductive.

The victories of Christianity are won chiefly by edifying and constructive efforts; destructive and controversial work must fail of its aim.

Ecclesiastical Honesty

By Bishop Francis J. McConnell.

There is in many quarters today a suspicion of ecclesiastical honesty. While only an occasional novel writer or embittered railer against the church would have the hardihood to declare that the official ministers of the church are deliberately insincere, there is, nevertheless, a rather widespread feeling that ecclesiastical honesty belongs in an ethical class by itself. The holder of the modern scientific views wonders if the spokesman of the church can be in the full sense honest and not allow these views to have more influence in his theological thinking or in his public address. The propagandist of various phases of social reorganization is puzzled at times at the rather cool reception his schemes receive from the ministers of the Gospel, and wonders if really honest men can fail to see the social defects to which he calls attention. The prophet of co-operation in church unity is at first encouraged by the ready applause which he finds for his appeal that the churches sink their differences and come closer together, and then bewildered at the reluctance which he encounters when he proposes some practical programme looking toward closer union. In quarters such as these the impression prevails that while at heart the churches may be sound the official ecclesiastics are not altogether honest in the finer sense of the term.

Of course a charge of dishonesty placed against the entire mass of ecclesiastics in the world would fall of itself for the simple reason first of all that the ecclesiastics are

too many in number. It is impossible successfully to lodge charges of insincerity against so numerous a body of men, especially when the vast majority in their private relationships are admitted to be above reproach, and when in their public capacity they are ostensibly labouring for the benefit of their fellow-men. But to dismiss the charge in a summary fashion would not answer a real question. Are the officers of the churches, the so-called priests and prophets, honest in the finer sense? What is there in their preaching and ecclesiastical practice which makes it possible for anyone even to suggest a lack of the highest ethical integrity? Perhaps those who raise the question will admit that the suspicion is unfounded if they can just be brought to see some problems from the point of view of the leaders of the churches. In any case, little good can come from ignoring the complaint.

One familiar with the latest theories of natural science or with the most recent applications of the scientific method to Biblical study may occasionally come upon a clergyman who indeed listens attentively to all these newer views. The adherent to scientific method is greatly delighted to find the clergyman so receptive and responsive. The conversation at the club room or before the fire in the cozy private parlour is most gratifying. Here at last is one minister open to the truth! The man's sermons will, of course, abound in allusions to latest scientific thinking, to say nothing of being coloured throughout with thoroughly modern presuppositions. The scientifically minded man fares forth to church on the next Sunday morning to hear one who evidently sees eye to eye with himself. What is his bewilderment to hear a sermon which does not refer to scientific truth at all and which evidently is founded on the assumptions of the day of dogmatism in theology. The listener cannot find it in his heart even to greet the minister after the sermon. He hurries back to his rooms in utter perplexity.

Can this conventional theologian be the same man who listened so attentively a few evenings ago to the latest phrasings of the evolutionary hypothesis, and who discussed with every mark of appreciation the latest positions in advanced Biblical criticism? Can such a prophet be a prophet at all? Can he really be an honest man?

Yes,—he may be an entirely honest man. The difficulty may lie not in the realm of ethics or even in that of philosophy, but rather in that of psychology. Very few ministers change either the content or the form of their preaching to any great extent after they have passed, let us say, the period of middle life. This does not mean that they repeat old sermons. They may write new sermons every week, but they have passed the period at which they are likely to remould their fundamental thinking. They are genuinely open to new truth but they hear the new truth rather than study it. Their preaching comes out of the statements of thought over which they wrestled in early manhood. They content themselves with more or less of a realization of the fact that at best a theological statement is but instrumental. They are really aiming at deepening and strengthening the religious life of those whom they are called to serve. But they cannot help using the old tools. Their hands have been accustomed to these and, as a matter of fact, they do better execution with the old tools than some men do with the new. So long as they are content to welcome the younger brethren who use the newer instruments there is no reason why even a scientist, aiming to get work done most efficiently, should too seriously object. Of course now if the conflict were between statements of truth each claiming to be final and absolute in itself the situation would be different. But theological statements, and scientific statements for that matter, do not always have much more than instrumental validity. The scientist is aiming at larger life for the mind. The preacher is aiming at larger life

for the whole man. If the preacher speaks in an old-fashioned way while at the same time welcoming light which he is psychologically incapacitated from using, his situation may indeed not be ideal. But he can hardly with justice be called dishonest.

The matter however goes deeper than this. Our scientific friend is not speaking merely of men who have passed the meridian. He has in mind much younger men, ministers whom he knows to have accepted modern views and yet who will not speak in public with the same freedom with which they speak in private. Truth is truth, and is to be uttered with complete fearlessness without regard to its effects upon any conceivable audience. The writer of this article once heard a courageous prophet tell of his independence of his audience. "When I am lecturing," said this prophet, "I seek simply to utter the truth without regard to the audience. They can understand or not understand. They can sympathize or not sympathize. If I so state my truth as to satisfy myself the audience can fall away." To which the sufficient answer is that the audience usually did fall away. And this brings us to consider that a minister in a church is not one who utters truth on its own account or on his own account. He is a teacher and as a teacher he has for his business not only to be loyal to the truth, but to get the truth understood. Language is an instrument not merely of self-utterance but of utterance to others besides ourselves. If a teacher succeeds chiefly in getting himself misunderstood it is hard to see how he can pride himself on any particular loyalty to the truth or on any superior type of honesty.

The minister is in better position than others to understand the temper of mind of those who look to him for instruction. He is not to be accused of juggling with his conscience when he makes attempts not to be misunderstood. "But what chance is there of misunderstanding?" our scientific friend asks. "Some matters before the

world of religious thought today are up for a definite answer—yes or no." In reply we urge that some problems which seem most clearly questions to be answered by yes or no would in multitudes of minds beget only confusion if thus answered. "Do you believe in the Virgin Birth? Answer, Yes or No." Here is a question which must deal with definite fact. Many can answer honestly yes or no. More than one thoroughly conscientious teacher might decline to answer if he were given only the choice of the two words, "Yes" or "No." He may well ask for opportunity to explain the meaning of his answer. Suppose he says, "No." Scores of persons may believe that by that answer he denies the divinity or deity of Christ. Probably it would not be too much to say that with the majority of believers today the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus is thought to depend upon the Virgin Birth. The answer "No" may mean nothing more to the minister himself than that he will not tie his belief in the divinity or deity of Jesus to one particular mode of incarnation. He may not think that he is doing violence to the Scripture in not taking the Infancy narratives as strict history. He may not intend to deny the deity of Christ. The flat "No" in this case would succeed chiefly in getting the minister misunderstood. Suppose, on the contrary, that the minister answers, "Yes." Here, too, there may be misunderstanding. The minister may accept the Virgin Birth as fact because it seems to him to provide fitting accompaniment of the coming of our Lord. He holds to the Scriptural narrative as fact because it falls in with his notion of the fitness of things. But he would like an opportunity to say that he does not accept that view of the universe which would make this method of incarnation of the Divine Son the only method. He rejoices in the narrative not because he believes that God must break through natural laws to reach us, but because he believes that God marked the beginning of the unique earthly Career with

a unique event. He would prefer an opportunity to say that he believes in the story of the Birth because he believes in Christ, rather than that he believes in Christ because he believes in the early chapters of Matthew and Luke.

No doubt we need men who simply proclaim their truth without regard to readers or hearers. Such men accept the misunderstanding of their particular time as a matter of course. They wait for the understanding of the future. The years themselves will bring the qualifications and modifications to what they say. But the minister is dealing with people who are here now. He is striving to lead inquiring minds step by step toward better views. For him the task is to get himself understood. It is his business to be understood. If now he uses the principle of accommodation in such fashion that he says what he does not believe just for the sake of making an adjustment with the minds of his followers, he is not honest. But if, on the other hand, he so accommodates himself to the minds dependent upon him that he sees how his statements would look from their standpoint and strives at every step to guard against serious misunderstanding, the charge of dishonesty can hardly be sustained. It is more honest to be fair with inquiring minds in the sense of trying to make the truth understood by those minds, than it is to utter in oracular fashion statements which posterity indeed may understand, but which the immediate contemporaries may find to be occasions for stumbling and wreck.

In addition to all those who accept the more modern views and who may seem to be over-cautious in teaching them there are those who seem inconsistent in that they accept this or that position, but draw back from taking further steps because they cannot see where they are to come out. This seems to the rigour-and-vigour moralist to be disloyalty to the truth. We should follow the truth no matter whither it leads us. Now while all this

sounds very fine it does not always help us. There are important philosophers of the pragmatic school today who would have us believe that one test of truth is the direction in which the road seems to point. Pragmatism aside, however, we are not to charge Christian teachers with lack of honesty when they wait to see what will be the practical consequences of the preaching of the newer statements of truth. In the realm of Christian teaching truth is supposed to show itself in the consequences which make for larger life. Not every minister has a talent for exploration in the realms of criticism or philosophy. Many look upon truth not only as something in itself but also as an instrument to be used for making lives true. When modern views are so preached as to leave believers less concerned about Christianity than before, we need not be surprised to find some leaders slow to begin the teaching of such views. For practical purposes all Christian formulations have to meet in the end the test as to their effect on life. There are many views of the Scripture which command the assent of Christian scholars which ought to receive the larger support of men in actual charge of parishes. The next step in the propagation of such views is not to question the sincerity of men who will not accept them off-hand, but to demonstrate their fitness to win men to the kingdom of God and to build men up in Christian character. The purpose of the Christian Scripture happens to be the production of Christian life, and any really important view of the Scriptures ought to show its worth as a nourisher of religious life. Some views have been victorious in the class room. We must not think men insincere who are waiting for light as to how to apply these views in the pulpit and the Bible school and the prayer meeting.

The second main class of those who suspect ecclesiastical honesty is composed of men deeply concerned in projects of social reform. How the ministers can remain as quiet as they do in the presence of grave economic and

political and social evils is a mystery to the social reformers. Of what use is the church if it does not lead in the social redemptions of the day? Of what use are ministers if they are not more sensitive than others to claims urged in the name of the highest morality? Do not ministers by their very silence show that they have become too snugly adjusted to the present system of things? A newspaper correspondent attends the meeting of a charities organization, or of a reform association, or of a radical labour party, and can see no ministers present. Forthwith he asks as to the whereabouts of the representatives of the church. We say "sees no ministers present" advisedly, for the ministers may be present even though the reporter does not see them. Ministers are present at practically every important meeting called to consider any serious social reform.

But accepting the complaint as measurably well-grounded what is the reply? The replies are rather numerous, when we come close to ministers who in their way are trying to bring in the kingdom of God. The first reply is that the minister may be busy with the ordinary routine work of his parish. He is visiting the sick, and instructing the children, and searching out the strangers. A devoted city pastor will in the course of a year make a thousand calls upon persons who are helped by the calls,—a social service in itself of no mean importance. This work strikes him as his first duty. He may make a mistake if he slips in quietly and takes a back seat at the meeting in aid of the unemployed. Perhaps he ought to show himself more openly, but he can hardly be called lacking in moral integrity for putting the regular work of the parish first. When it comes to finding solicitors for the funds for whatever enterprise is on he will not be overlooked,—nor will he prove unresponsive.

But does not the minister see that we need profound social re-adjustment,—that the industrial times are

sadly out of joint? The minister's reply may be altogether annoying to the social reformer. He may admit all that the reformer points out about the evil of the times. He may deplore these evils with a grief which is none the less deep and serious because it seldom bursts forth into invective. He may not think of himself as possessing the technical insight required to suggest detailed improvements in the social order. But since the one great need of all time is largeness and fulness of inner life he may think of himself as doing his best in trying to deepen the springs of that life and in holding on high the spiritual ideals. In any system the only path for improvement lies through the coming into society of a new spirit. The minister may be labouring for the coming of that spirit. His attitude may be somewhat akin to that of the artist. The artist may be a social revolutionary, and in some way his principles may show themselves in his artistic creations; but for the most part the artist keeps to his ideals regardless of what the particular social institutional life of the time may be. His work may help on the new day by its embodiment of the principles of beauty which will reign in that new day, but his influence is most effectively exerted as he remains an artist. The anti-tuberculosis workers, or the labourers for the betterment of prison conditions, or the propagandists for better divorce law may ask him if he cannot paint or carve something which will bear directly on their particular causes; but if his art does something to make ideal humanity more real as a force in the minds of men, the artist will have done his part for the furtherance of all reforms alike. So with the minister. He may take his calling at least as seriously as if he were an artist. He may consider that the best way he can help is to set forth the idea of man and the idea of God which must underlie all social advance whatsoever. A student interested in social advance once heard a minister preach on the stew-

ardship of wealth. The sermon attempted to expound the principles of Jesus as to the use of material possessions. At the conclusion of the sermon the student of social questions remarked: "I am glad he did not mention the Trusts." A less discerning critic might have pronounced such an omission a fatal flaw in the sermon, but the trained student saw a statement of the everlasting Christian principle so irresistible that any man could make an application for himself. Moreover there is reason to fear that some men who have stated most clearly the social principles of the Gospels have been compelled to suffer question as to their integrity because they have not felt it necessary to carry the principles into implications which might better be left to the social or legislative expert.

But we must go farther. There is a certain relativity about the moral character of the successive phases of social advance. Every stage of progress is at least in its initial phases good, or at least better than what has been before. Otherwise it would not be a stage of progress. Soon this stage begins to pass, and merge into something else. After a while the stage is seen as imperfect and inadequate, perhaps as evil; and the day is at hand for a fresh advance. Now in that in-between time when one phase is passing and another is arriving the charges of dishonesty fly back and forth, thick and fast. It is the hour for charity everywhere, yet progress is sometimes delayed by needless asperity and recrimination.

Let us take a social state which may be ahead of us, or which may never come in the form in which it is now preached. So far as radical programmes for social reform are concerned socialism in one shape or another would just now seem to have more votes than any other. Let us suppose for argument that as the result of some sudden crisis, socialism is voted in by the countries which we now think of as parts of Christendom; or let us imagine that the close of the present European war should

see socialism installed as an actual system in the countries now engaged in the conflict. At first the new day would be hailed with great rejoicing. Men would find the laws so organized, let us say, that possibilities of co-operation would appear as never before. Suppose all the socialistic dreams to come true,—the earth responding with fertility, the industrial organization running without friction, fraud and oppression vanishing from business and politics. What would be the next step? Since one guess is as good as another, let us fancy that there arises in that socialistic order a group of prophets who resent so much hard-and-fast mechanism in law. They weary of the statute-book. They would not go back to an anarchic individualism but they would have a kind of spiritual anarchism, in which men are held together by their innate brotherhood rather than by the clamps of any set of rules. Just as a true marriage stands without reliance on divorce laws so a true society should get along without the statute-book. Men should stand together because of their liking for one another and because of their dependence on one another. This could be so preached as to be a noble social gospel. But in carrying through the propaganda honest differences of opinion would appear. One man would fear that the time for the abolition of formal law had not yet come. Another would point to the numbers of uneducated persons for whom the law must be a schoolmaster. Another would protest that the mere reliance upon mutual good will would not be strong enough to stand the strain of unusual crisis. Now here might be a society under a highly advanced organization, with all the leaders striving for the good of the whole, and yet with some of the most conscientious of them laying themselves open to the charge of not being obedient to the higher ethical vision.

There are indeed some ministers who are unworthy in their defence of the present system. Some are just chaplains of the prosperous selfish, and think as the selfish do.

But such are few. Though the present industrial and political condition is in sad need of improvement there are many ministers who think there is much in the present system worth saving. The wider our familiarity with ministerial conservatism the more surely we see that much of such conservatism springs from a desire to save what seems to them worth saving. And systems apart,—the pastor of the rich man thinks, or ought to think, that the rich man himself is worth saving. Over against the minister who falls into the social ways and attitudes which are essentially pagan must be put the faithful priest of God who deals honestly as spiritual adviser with those of his people who are making an unchristian use of wealth. Whereas many a social reformer declares that the social evils of our day are inherent and inevitable faults of the system itself,—faults for which no individual is to blame,—many a priest of God tells his people that they personally are responsible for what happens even at the outer ends of their industrial and political influences. And paradoxical as it may sound both reformer and minister may be right.

The larger number of preachers speak to that middle class which is itself the vast social majority. Here again the social reformer is apt to break out with strictures upon the preacher. But when we are speaking of "average" minds of any sort, ministerial or lay, we have to be on our guard lest we forget that we cannot safely bring charges of dishonesty against so numerous a class of persons. It would be amusing, for example, to call the great mass of average persons in the world dishonest, for that includes the huge majority. The majority may however be ethically mediocre, and that may be what the social reformer means when he reflects upon the ethics of the middle class and of the preachers to the middle class. A distinguished writer on social themes recently gave it as his matured conviction that no popular preacher could be honest. Of course we are at a

loss here until we have a few definitions. If the critic meant that a man cannot be popular in the sense of pleasing the crowds without letting down below the highest ethical requirements there may be weight in the charge. But the preacher popular in the sense of reaching the people may be highly honest. To be sure, a man who ministers to the people must in a sense be of the people. He cannot preach down to them. He may be to a degree a product of the forces which work through the masses, but he may be at the same time a leader toward a new day for society. What was said about the relation of the minister to modern intellectual movements may be repeated here. The true minister has to lead. If he is to lead he must not necessarily accommodate his truth to popular conceptions, but he must accommodate the length of his stride to those whom he is leading.

It might be well if our friends outside the churches who are labouring for social progress would try to realize the humanness of the material with which the minister has to deal. In these days the successful minister has to be a really human being. He meets people on the distinctively human side. The agitator speaks of classes and of upper or middle class oppressors. Now the minister knows the oppressor of the capitalistic class as a rather vigorous gentleman of marked prejudices and a habit of cutting short what other people have to say, but often as a man who has openness of mind and vision if you can once get to him with what he calls "a definite proposition." The minister knows the middle class tyranny to be composed of hard-working persons who are struggling to pay their rent while they get their boys through college. He knows the labouring man not as a potential bomb-thrower but as an intelligent reader at least of the newspapers and as a father anxious to give his children a chance. He sat by the capitalist when the eldest son died, called on the middle class man when the bank went down, and conducted the funeral

services of the workman's child when the epidemic came. And the impression of the minister is that the men from all three so-called classes are pretty much alike.

Toward anything which promises substantial relief to human beings in actual distress the minister is very apt to have both eyes and ears open. The preachers who are at all successful today are reading more widely about current social movements than are the members of any other group outside the leaders of the movements themselves. After a somewhat extended observation of the books that ministers buy the present writer is convinced that more volumes on socialism and kindred themes are sold to preachers than to any other groups outside of those who, like teachers of economics, are making professional study of social questions. A distinguished sociologist recently declared in private conversation that he long ago learned that preachers are the last persons over whom the reformers should worry, that all the ministerial leaders who are at all influential are willing to further any cause which has human welfare at heart. Even if the church as an institution seems to be on the side of conservatism and suffers from that sluggishness and inertness which are part of the original weakness of any organization, there are always leaders of wide-ranging interests who will swing the church, slowly to be sure, but inevitably to the side of any cause which promises help to men. If we are met with the question as to why the great pioneers in social advance are so often outside the organized church the answer is that they are outside just because the church is organized. Organization means the tying together of all sorts of elements, and the slow elements hold back the swift. The pioneer must run on ahead. But the massive work after all is done by the mass of the army. The battles are fought not by aeroplanists or by horsemen or by artillery-men but by the host of those who come up on foot. This article is not an

attempt to make out a case for lazy or cowardly preachers. Such individuals are found in pulpits here and there. It is rather to help social leaders toward a better understanding of large numbers of spiritual counsellors who know more about the teachings of the leaders than the leaders suspect, and who sympathize as deeply with those whom the reformers are trying to help as do the reformers themselves. And while the ethics of the preacher may seem faulty to the specialist the preacher is very apt to have the advantage in the comprehensiveness of his view of the human problem and the humanness of his own approach to the solution of that problem.

Still another occasion for the complaint of dishonesty against the officials of the churches arises over the question of closer mutual relationship on the part of the various denominational divisions. The man outside often dismisses with a sneer all claim on the part of the church representative to be the teacher of lofty ethics because of the unwillingness of the churches to forget their differences in the presence of the allied forces of evil in the world. And this outside feeling is no stronger than that of some inside the church itself who become wearied over the slow progress of the parts of the body of Christ toward real co-ordination. Such feel that talk about closer approach goes on very well until some practical plan is actually formulated. Then the leaders find excuses. A shrewdly discerning spectator soon surmises that the type of co-operation which each ecclesiastic inwardly desires is the absorption by his own body of all the other bodies. So the question arises as to whether the movements toward closer denominational union are fundamentally sincere. Do not the leaders of each denominational body after all think of their particular denomination as the sole depository of religious truth?

In spite of all seeming to the contrary the movement toward closer relationship is fundamentally honest. Each denomination does not think of itself as the sole

guardian of religious truth. The very fact of tolerance ought to go a long way toward dispelling that notion, for if each or any one is the sole vessel of truth there can be no tolerance of any other. All leaders are coming more or less distinctly to see that the essential truth of Christianity is the truth of the Christian life itself. The one great heresy on which all agree is the heresy of false living. The different organizations are so many different approaches to the Life,—or so many different instruments which aid in the cultivation or expression of the Life. The body is the instrument and expression of the soul. There is little denial today of the truth that the various churches are parts of the one body of Christ, and there is great desire everywhere that the parts shall be organized into such coherency that the church shall be the true body of Christ on earth.

How then shall we understand the hesitancy in the face of this or that practical suggestion? The answer is not far to seek. The movement toward closer relationship is today misunderstood by multitudes. The suggestion made too many times is of a sort of levelling process by which uniformity is to be produced. Now while schemes which work toward uniformity on a large scale were once heralded as promising a new day they are in our time regarded with suspicion. For example, consider the movements toward world empire in the realm of international state-craft. There was a time when statesmen of this or that nation dreamed of spreading just one type of national life and thought over the widest possible area of the earth's surface. But attempts to do this have not been especially successful. It has been found in experience that the only sort of empire that will work is the kind that will unite its component parts for the tasks they can best perform together, and leave them separate for the tasks which they can best perform separately. The measure of success which has attended the attempt to build up the British Empire

has come out of the recognition of this principle. The Empire rigorously and of set purpose leaves local activities to local agencies in so far as these do not conflict with the larger purposes of the Empire. To take a further instance, we observe in the more progressive democracies today repeated insistence upon the doctrine that nothing in the spread of democracy shall be allowed to level down what is worth while in the distinctiveness of individuals or of groups. The Roman Catholic church, which has aimed most definitely at world-wide spiritual empire, long ago discovered that she could preserve herself only by making room for the utmost diversity of activity in the realms which do not conflict with the direct authority of the supreme power. In our attempts to bring the churches to closer co-operation we who have this cause at heart should remember that the one lasting service of denominationalism has been to develop diversity in the manifestation of religious life. Diversity is an essentially Christian principle. The kingdom of God is supposed to contain within itself the most astonishing divergencies and contrasts. When now we see the hesitancy of some ecclesiastical leader to follow a line toward practical co-operation which we suggest we must not think he has been insincere in his previous protestations of interest in the cause of closer fellowship. The hesitancy may be only instinctive, but when we seek for its cause we are apt to find that there is a suspicion that something of spiritual value may be lost. The "way" which one church has travelled, may not be as important as the broader road some other church has travelled, but there are those who would not care to have the lesser road altogether closed. The accents in which one body of believers utter the truth may not be as euphonious as those of some other body, but those who have learned the less euphonious accents prefer them. Suppose for example there could be put before the world some new language which all men could master without

much intellectual stress. It is entirely conceivable that all men everywhere might forthwith pick up the language for large general use. But suppose the teachers of the new language should forthwith insist that no one should ever speak thereafter in his own language. At once there would come a protest that the existing languages already contain so much of perennial value that they cannot be allowed at once to drop into disuse. What seems like inconsistency on the part of many men who will vote for the general proposition of church union, and who then will stand back from this or that particular detailed scheme is the failure to see how the particular scheme will preserve elements in Christian belief and practice which seem important. The inconsistency is not so much inconsistency as genuine desire to hold fast that which is good while attempting to prove the worth of the new plan.

This article happens to be written by one who desires the speedier appropriation of modern scientific methods in the search for religious truth, the more heroic onslaught on social inadequacies by the Church, and the quick coming of a new day of close co-ordination and correlation of the various parts of the Christian body. The article is not a plea for compromise and half-measures but for patience and sympathy in the attempt to see these problems from the point of view of some men whose conscientiousness is for the most part above question.

Natural Law and Belief in Miracle[1]

By Professor Dr. Carl Stange,
University of Göttingen.

I. THE PROBLEM

That miracle plays a great rôle in connection with Christian belief is an undoubted fact. But at the same time it has always been regarded as a problem, and especially at the present time the question of miracles brings up many difficulties. There are numerous people who, without discussion, altogether reject belief in the miraculous. They are convinced that in the face of modern science as a whole it is not possible to speak seriously any longer of miracle.

There are two considerations that make belief in the miraculous quite impossible: (1) modern natural science, and (2) modern historical science. First, taking up *modern natural science*, it is undeniably true that one of its most certain results is the acceptance of all that occurs in the world as a fixed relationship of cause and effect. Every cause has its effect and every effect its cause. Between cause and effect there exists an established relation, so that a particular cause is always followed by the same effect. If we have recognized any particular cause in its operation, we know that at all times and under all circumstances the relation of cause

[1] The thoughts which follow here have been stated more completely and discussed in connection with recent literature on the subject in my book, *Christentum und moderne Weltanschauung*, II, 1914 (Deichert).

and effect will remain the same. In other words, what happens in the world is an occurrence necessarily determined by the causal connection. The moment we apply the conception of causality in the above sense to all that happens in the world, it is clear immediately that miracle is impossible. For the word miracle has certainly without any reservation been interpreted as something which breaks into the causal nexus.

Miracle is therefore not simply actually impossible but it involves a contradiction besides. It is not possible actually because the causal connection is a fixed one and therefore leaves no room for the entrance of a supernatural cause. And the conception of miracle is self-contradictory, for in a miracle we are dealing with an occurrence which lies outside the causal connection and yet appears within the same connection. Miracle is claimed to be a real event in the world, and yet it must be unlike those events which are accepted as the whole reality in the world. So far then, miracle is altogether impossible from the standpoint of the principles of modern science.

We may also note in harmony with this position that with the growth of modern science interest in miracles died away naturally. In the movement of English Deism about the beginning of the eighteenth century, the miraculous element in Christianity was for the first time critically attacked. In the period of Enlightenment it was simply given a new interpretation. In the nineteenth century it came to be taken for granted by large classes of people that miracle only presents a symbolical embodiment of religious thoughts explicable from the limited point of view of the scriptural author. Even such a man as Schleiermacher maintained this attitude in reference to miracles. In his address to Lücke, he expressly affirmed that according to his conviction the time for belief in miracles had finally passed. It would be of no help if we tried with all kinds of apologetic artifices to preserve the miracles of the New Testament,

not to mention the miracles of the Old Testament. Belief in the miraculous is once for all destroyed and the Christian community must prepare itself for its work without the miraculous element.

Now in like manner *modern historical science* has destroyed the confidence in the biblical narratives of miracle. Biblical criticism generally has thrown grave doubt over the reliability of the biblical tradition. It has at the same time awakened and encouraged positively the appreciation of the human side of the life of Jesus. Moreover, through modern comparative religion it has spread abroad the knowledge that miracles are related in connection with other religions and that the miracles of non-Christian religions are not to be differentiated essentially from those of the biblical religion. It is a characteristic of every religion that it is decorated with miracle stories. This is especially true of those religions which go back to a particular historical founder. These historical religions always tend to surround their beginnings with a crown of miracles and so to express their conviction of their divine origin. As a final point it is to be noted that every separate religion places its miracles in competition with others. It must do so in order to maintain its own uniqueness and absolute truth as opposed to other religions. Now from the fact that every religion rejects the miracles of others, it follows that no religion has the right to appeal to the miraculous.

Although these arguments against belief in the miraculous seem to be very illuminating and are most widely accepted, it is possible, on the other hand, to observe that on the part of Christianity objection is ever raised against abandoning the miraculous. In evangelical theology, particularly in the last decade, an extraordinarily active discussion has raged in regard to the miraculous. And in its course, not only the representatives of traditional theology have appeared as champions of belief

in the miraculous; rather, theologians of various schools have taken part in these debates and have come out for the necessity of belief in miracle. It is to be noticed that even by such theologians as desire under all circumstances to maintain their sympathy with the modern point of view, the dismissal of the miraculous is regarded as impossible. This is true not only of theologians; even in circles of lay people who adhere to Christianity it is more significant to note the conviction that the abandonment of miracles is identical with the abandonment of Christianity. Quite generally the attitude towards the miraculous is actually accepted as a criterion of an acknowledgment of Christianity.

It is clear, then, that the elimination of miracle from its connection with Christian belief must be fatal to the existence of Christian belief. First, it is self-evident that by it the dependability of the biblical tradition is affected in a very serious way. It is true there are many who hold that the Bible will keep its significance even if the miraculous is left aside as legendary. But the attempt need only be made to go over the New Testament from this point of view. It is not a question of the telling of a few miracles here and there. The implication of the miraculous meets us on every page of the New Testament. If we desire to get rid of it, we shall have as good as nothing left.

Just as certain is it that the abandonment of the belief in miracle would indicate an absolute break with the historical past of Christianity. For it can not be denied that in the whole history of Christianity belief in miracle has stood at the centre of interest and that it has been just the conspicuous leaders of Christianity who have been firmly convinced of the actuality of the miraculous.

To conclude, we can demonstrate from the various principles of Christian dogma that belief in miracle extends over the whole content of the Christian faith. It is characteristic too of the Christian conception of

God that God is thought of as a God of miracle. This appears from the moment that we accept God as the Creator, for by so speaking of Him we do not wish to describe Him simply in the sense of Deism as the Cause of the world; rather we desire to say that the world is to be regarded as a *free act* of God, and so far is a miracle. We therefore speak in Christianity of the miracle of creation. And by so doing we apply to the relation of God to the world the conception of Providence and consequently we construct the conception of the miracles of Providence. By putting it in this way we mean that what happens in the world is not to be regarded as a purely mechanical process, that rather in these events there is active the free, personal will of God. And exactly the same thing is involved in the person of Christ. We need only recall the dogma of the supernatural birth and the belief in the resurrection of Jesus. In both cases we plainly have to do with miracles. Just as, in accordance with this principle, the life of Christ is surrounded by miracles and just as His life is filled with miraculous acts, according to the biblical tradition, so we place also the person of Jesus in relation with the history of man's salvation. This means not only that every happening in the world is under the immediate direction of God's providence; rather it signifies that in the history of human life there is a special and particular relationship in which, in turn, is involved an immediate activity of the divine will. This process of the history of salvation is again constantly accompanied by miracles. Allied with the conception of the miracle of creation and the miracle of providence is, as we see, the miracle of salvation.

And finally we have to do in the teaching of the Holy Ghost with an immediate action of God on the individual man. This immediate activity of God on the individual has as its result the production of a new life in us. So we attain to the idea of the miracle of conversion. This transformation of man we are accustomed to call the

miracle of conversion. Where the relation of God to the individual is in question there is involved, however, not simply the miracle of conversion. The new life of the converted is realized in prayer, and prayer assumes that God hears it. So we are brought to the idea that in connection with the happenings in the world there can be occurrences which may be regarded as immediate answers of God to prayer. Thus in its completion the conception of miracle is reached. It is, as we see, a many-sided one; we speak of miracles of creation, miracles of providence, miracles of salvation, miracles of conversion and miracles of prayer. Now from these various examples it follows that there is absolutely no expression of Christian belief which does not come into contact with the thought of miracle in some way.

On this account arises the dilemma in which we find ourselves in respect of the miraculous. On the one hand, it can not be denied that the modern view of the world excludes the miraculous, and, on the other, it can be as little denied that belief in miracle is of fundamental significance for Christianity. We can not retain the Christian faith if we eliminate miracle. It is hopeless if we essay to get round the difficulty by trying to cut loose miracle from Christian belief as if only in a time, which knew nothing of modern natural science, the idea of miracle came to be bound up with the Christian faith. If we wish to keep hold at all of the Christian faith we are bound to keep hold too, of the principle of miracle. And those people who think that Christianity can be maintained even without miracle will be obliged either entirely to abandon Christianity or in any case keep some secret place reserved for belief in the miraculous.

In the face of this dilemma there is really only one way of escape. If it is absolutely impossible to think of Christianity without miracle, the question remains, whether the contradiction between miracle and the mod-

ern point of view is insoluble. We can seek to overcome the difficulty by trying to ascribe the opposition involved in the case to a misunderstanding and to a false formulation of ideas. This is, as a matter of fact, the way in which one is wont to solve the problem of miracle.

Here naturally we have before us a double task. We must first take up the modern conception of nature in order to see whether actually this *conception of nature* is free from objection when it excludes the miraculous. Next, we must take up the *conception of miracle*, in order to determine whether actually the conception of miracle, as far as it is placed in opposition to the modern conception of nature, is correctly defined.

After answering these two questions we are in a position to establish the point that both the accurate analysis of the modern conception of nature, and the correct description of miracle, are left out if we accept the usual definition of miracle. The ordinary definition of miracle is as follows: that in the case of miracle there is involved a *violation of natural law*. This definition of miracle is false. It assumes an untenable conception of nature and also an equally untenable conception of miracle.

II. THE CONCEPTION OF NATURE

By understanding miracle as a violation of natural law we assume an untenable conception of nature. As a violation of natural law, miracle can only be so defined under the assumption of a really clear and precise conception of nature, which today we can no longer accept as accurate. To make this point plain, we are bound to remember that the conception of nature is not at all times the same; rather, this conception has been subject to historical processes. Besides, in the history of the conception of nature certain periods can be clearly distinguished.

The first period is the period of the ancient conception of nature. This can be described as the naïve conception

of nature. This means that in antiquity there was nothing like the modern conception of natural law. Of course, even in antiquity there was acknowledged to be a regularized order of events in the world. But this regularized order of events in the world came from the fact that in the world we had to do with a system of powers or forces. Each force had its particular peculiarity, its quality. There were higher and lower powers. This difference in their qualities explained why one power was subordinate to another. Although, as we see, there was a great difference between the separate powers, this does not mean that the world was a chaos. The distinction existing between them was a mutual limitation imposed on all. The higher power was a guarantee that the lower remained within the limits assigned to it. So, despite the difference of the powers, order was possible. And this idea of the orderly system of the world will be fixedly guaranteed if in the graduated scale of powers there is a highest one, superior to all the rest, and therefore able to limit all the rest. This highest power would answer to the idea of God.

The naïve conception of nature, according to this analysis, makes use of the conception of a qualitatively determined cause. Now in this sense the conception of the world does not exclude the conception of God. Rather, the opposite is true; the conception of the world is only completed in the conception of God. For if the different powers are mutually graded in relation to their quality, there must naturally be a final and highest cause in this graded scale of qualitatively determined causes.

The immediate action of God in the world, under such assumptions as these, can be no problem at all. For the divine causality is distinguished from the world causality exactly as the different types of world causality are differentiated from one another. The problem of miracle thus becomes identical with the question, how is it pos-

sible at all for two qualitatively different powers to work together. With this conception of nature, it is plain that miracles can never be regarded as a contradiction of nature. The conception of miracle is rather implicitly involved in this conception of nature.

But this ancient or naïve conception of nature soon showed itself to be not permanently valid. Its defect consisted in its comparative uselessness for the scientific knowledge of the world. Science has to consider always the necessary elements of knowledge. Now in this naïve conception of nature the factor of accident plays a very large rôle. The divergent quality of the powers of nature is something altogether accidental. We have no general standard at all by which we may determine the different characteristics of the separate natural causes. The quality of the powers of nature can only be perceived by the organs of sensation, they can not be determined by the intelligence. But it is to the interest of science that the factor of accident shall be removed from the conception of nature.

And so we come to the second period in the history of the conception of nature. This period begins with the rise of modern science in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and we can indicate it as the period of the *deterministic conception of nature.* The characteristic of this second period is that the conception of power as the qualitatively determined cause is done away by the conception of the non-qualitative cause. The qualitatively determined cause is a specific quantity. We are therefore obliged to analyze it. In the conception of the qualitative cause both sensation and intelligence have a part. What sensation contributes to this idea is quality. What is accessible to the understanding is the pure conception of power without relation to its quality. When we abstract from power the quality apprehended by sensation, nothing is left but the bare association of cause and effect.

So we find that nature from this standpoint is no longer a system of powers but an association of causes and effects. In the place of power is therefore substituted the conception of natural law. And this conception of natural law affirms as a consequence that all happening stands in a necessary connection. From this standpoint it is plain that the conception of miracle is altogether impossible.

From this deterministic conception of natural law it is, in the first place, quite impossible to construct the conception of divine causality. The deterministic conception of nature knows only the conception of a non-qualitative cause. Therefore the distinction of a natural and a divine cause is wholly impossible. We might ask, how could the specific action of divine causality exist in contrast with the system of natural causality, when the very conception of a non-qualitative cause fundamentally excludes all difference!

Now if, in spite of all this, we bring the conception of a divine causality into relation with the deterministic conception of nature, the peculiarity of divine causality can only be seen in the absolute negation of natural causality. Starting from the deterministic conception of nature, there would be given a definition of miracle that would make it a suspension or violation of natural law.

The definition of miracle as a violation of natural law is only possible under the assumption of a deterministic conception of nature. Yet under the assumption of a deterministic conception of nature this definition is, as we know, altogether senseless, since for the deterministic conception of nature there can be a reality only in the form of an event according to natural law and nothing else,—and miracle is asserted to be not an event in accordance with natural law and yet one which belongs to reality. Yet even in this second period the history of the conception of nature is not ended. The conception of the law of nature gives rise to very dif-

ferent kinds of questioning. In thinking of natural law we clearly have in mind the separate laws of which natural science speaks. These laws were found by the method of experimentation. But if this is the case, the question arises, how is it possible to bring at the same time in connection with this special natural law the idea of an impenetrable order, an absolute necessity?

The methods of knowledge used in natural science are observation and experiment. By the aid of these media of knowledge it is only possible to establish what *actually* happens, but never that anything *necessarily* happens. How does it come about that the conception of natural law got to be associated with the idea of a necessary connection of events?

If observation and experiment, *i.e.* experience in general, leads to the drawing up of particular laws of nature, we must reckon still with the fact that under certain circumstances experience leads to other results, to a correction of the laws of nature so drawn up. And actually in the course of history, such a constant process of correction has taken place in regard to natural law. We need only to think of the different theories of light, electricity, and so on.

Therefore the representatives of natural science are prepared on principle to concede to particular natural laws only a conditional significance. They allow without debate that the particular laws of nature can be replaced by others. The laws of nature, in a certain sense, are only hypotheses for the knowledge of phenomena. They have on the whole only a practical meaning. By the help of the formula we have prepared, we try to bring order into the world of phenomena in order to find our way about in it.

This attitude towards natural laws as simply hypotheses, according to which they are treated as mere formula for the regular action of events, so far as these have been hitherto observed, is extraordinarily wide-

spread at the present time. Especially among the representatives of modern science is this empirical-sceptical tendency prominent. The modern representatives of natural science freely allow that all so-called natural laws have only a relative significance, and that we must be prepared at any time to face a revision of these apparently absolutely certain formulas.

But in spite of this no representative of modern science thinks that on account of this the achievements of modern science contained in the conception of natural law must be given up. The really basic idea, characteristic of modern science, to which it owes its greatest success, is the idea of the complete supremacy of the conception of causality. Though we assume the untenability of the separate laws of nature, the general idea of the regularity controlling events remains intact. Even if in separate cases we can not fully penetrate the causal connection, in all scientific investigation the principle remains firm that we must ever strive to understand better the causal connection of all events. The separate laws of nature may ultimately require revision,—*the idea* of natural law is despite this the rule for all scientific knowledge.

Therefore it is wholly false when theologians adopt this scepticism in relation to separate natural laws in order to apply it for apologetic interests. They point in triumph to those expressions of the modern investigators of nature in which they acknowledge the relative character of the different laws of nature, and by doing so think they have won free room for belief. They suppose that this confession of natural science, in which it concedes its limitations, tends to discredit the position of natural science, the result being that it can no longer stand in the way of the religious point of view, or rather, that belief can pursue its own thoughts unhindered by natural science.

But such a procedure is to be strenuously opposed. Even if the separate natural laws are transformed, the

point of view of natural science, *i.e.* the pure causal way of looking at events in the world, is untouched by the change. And even if the temporarily prevailing axioms of natural science are so much affected by new discoveries, the result will be that the idea of cause will only be placed on a better foundation. Whatever may be the fortunes of modern natural science, its permanent significance is found in the fact that in all its investigations it is determined by the one idea, that everything that happens in the world is in a uniform system of causes and effects.

Moreover, even if there is no thought of exploiting in any way for apologetic purpose the confessedly limited validity of the separate natural laws, we are bound to acknowledge that the situation pictured above gives occasion to earnest thought. I mean we must ask ourselves the question, *after all what is the basis for the general idea of natural law?*

If we survey the origin of this idea, we get in any case the impression that the general idea of natural law is derived from the several laws of nature. In the different fields of the world's happenings the observation has been made that there is in them a certain regularity which bears the character of necessity. By abstracting from the different cases, there arises the general idea of a necessity in natural law.

But this conclusion taken from the separate laws of nature and applied to a general natural law falls to pieces the moment the relativity of separate laws is conceded. If the separate laws of nature have only a hypothetical significance, they can not establish the necessity of the general natural law. On the contrary, the general law of nature is what gives in the first instance their necessity to the separate laws of nature.

So we are confronted with an argument in a circle; we reach the idea of the general law of nature only through the individual laws, and the individual laws attain their

validity only by the general law of nature. The conclusion is that with the necessity of the separate laws of nature the necessity of a general law of nature also disappears. An escape from this difficulty would only be possible if another origin could be shown for that general idea of natural law. And this is the solution which Kant gave. Kant's theory of knowledge introduces the third period of the history of the idea of nature, the period of the *idealistic* conception of nature.

In this conception belongs the new contribution of Kant, that the idea of natural law is an idea not constructed from experience, rather, in it we have to do with an idea of our understanding. The conception of causality is not attained by abstraction from the phenomenal world. This conception is rather an original category of our understanding that we apply to all experience.

The new discovery of Kant consists in this, that we can not understand reality at all if we try to analyze it without reference to the subjective conditions of our knowledge. What we call experience is not a subjective datum existing independent of our knowledge. All experience is compounded from material given us through sensation and from the form which our understanding gives this material. The moment we more carefully investigate the matter and the form of our knowledge, it is clear that the matter given us through sensation bears the character of the accidental, while, on the other hand, the share of our understanding in the knowledge of reality supplies the basis for the idea of the necessity to our knowledge.

Taking this position of Kant, it is certainly self-evident that we have the general idea of natural law, although to this idea there exactly corresponds no single natural law. In the case of the idea of natural law, we are concerned with a rule of our understanding that we have to apply to the phenomenal world if we wish to

attain to any kind of scientific knowledge, a knowledge we are never able to apply in absolute completeness.

Now we are able to define the conception of nature in an idealistic sense: nature is the world of phenomena as taken in by the understanding. In this formula the significance as well as the limitations of the knowledge of natural science are made clear. For, in the first place, all that belongs to the world of phenomena must be able to be included by the understanding, that is, made possible to be arranged in the form of natural science. But, secondly, knowledge of natural science always extends only so far as we have to do with the knowledge of the world of phenomena according to the standard of the understanding. Nature is reality as it is presented to the understanding.

In this formula there is expressed at the same time the truth that nature is not the whole of reality. Our knowledge is not simply conditioned by sensation and understanding; in all knowledge perception also has a distinct part so far as only what is given through perception is presented as real. The presentations given us in sensation can, it is true, be illusions, and the object of thought in our understanding can remain in the sphere of bare possibility. But so soon as to our presentations a reality value is ascribed, there must be added to sensation and to understanding this third factor, namely, perception. Therefore we have in perception the standard for the value of experience as reality. From this it follows directly that in every single instance of any event that takes place in the world the purely scientific point of view has its limits. This is quite clear when we realize that we never can make understandable the *existence* of the event by the help of natural science. Natural science regards the world, it may be, as a system of identical atoms which are related to one another in an infinite and manifold reciprocal action. But that there is this infinite sum of atoms lies outside the purview of natural

science. And in the same way no single moment in our experience of reality can be analysed by the conceptions of natural science.

In the sphere of perception we have also to do with religion.[2] From this it follows that the expressions of the religious consciousness must necessarily be so constructed that they lie outside the conceptions of natural science without one being able on that account to speak of a suspension of such scientific conceptions. It is true we can not derive from the idealistic conception of nature the conception of miracle; but we can certainly understand that the religious consciousness in its assertions regarding the reality reached by it must embrace types of ideas that are not to be measured by the standards of scientific knowledge.

A final declaration regarding the positive status of the conception of miracle is, as we see, not reached in this way. But when one pictures the development which the conception of nature has gone through, so much certainly is clear, that it is really not the conception of nature that causes miracle to be represented as a setting aside of natural law; rather, that this formula is possible only under the assumption of a deterministic conception of nature,—and that under such an assumption it is altogether senseless. But the criticism of the deterministic conception of nature leads to the limitation of the conception of nature, and this limitation means that we learn so to ask for the peculiarity of the religious conscience and its appropriate ideas. The idealistic criticism of the conception of nature is not at all a positive foundation for belief in miracle; but it does leave a place free for the possibility of belief in miracle and forces us to look for a decision regarding the conception of miracle exclusively in the field of the religious consciousness.

[2] Compare, *Christentum und moderne Weltanschauung*, I, *Das Wesen der Religion*, 2nd Ed., 1913.

III. THE CONCEPTION OF MIRACLE

A collision between the conception of miracle and the conception of nature can only come about if we are using a false conception of nature. But the other principle is also true that a collision of the conception of miracle with the conception of nature can only come about if we are dealing with a false conception of miracle. That the idea of a violation of natural law is not required by religious interests we can make clear in different ways.

I agree that it is a widespread opinion that miracle belief can exist at all only in a time in which the conception of natural law was not yet known. The opponents of belief in miracles are especially fond of using this argument and they fancy they have disposed once for all of belief in miracle. If belief in the miraculous can only come into existence where nothing is known of the conception of natural law, it is self-evident that such belief is destroyed in the case of those who hold the conception of natural law as an assured element of knowledge in science.

By arguing in this way, it is not observed that the conclusion is self-contradictory. If we say the belief in miracle arose in a time that did not yet know the conception of natural law, the negation of natural law was not involved in the question of belief in miracle. If nothing was known as yet of natural law, no one could then define miracle as a violation of natural law. But this absolutely self-evident and certainly unassailable conclusion involves something else. Interest in miracle must have originally been placed on a different ground and the definition of miracle as a violation of natural law can not concern the real motive of belief in the miraculous. To this we must add something already adverted to that there are different kinds of miracle; miracles of creation and providence, miracles of salvation, miracles of conversion and prayer. All these different kinds of miracle

have an essential rôle in Christianity and we have constantly the feeling that in all these kinds of miracle we are actually dealing with miracle. It is only possible to determine rightly the conception of miracle if it harmonizes with all these different kinds of miracle.

From this it is directly clear that we can not speak of a violation of natural law if we speak of the miracle of creation. If we posit the world under the conception of creation and regard it therefore as an immediate work of God, *i.e.* as a miracle, we are assuredly not in any way intending to speak of a violation of natural law. On the contrary, where we judge the world to be a miracle of God, this comes to our consciousness just when we experience in it the regularity and order, in which we seem to recognize God's will. Parallel to the miracle of creation is to be placed the conception of miracle in the world order. The conception of miracle in creation is an absolutely conclusive proof that the conception of miracle does not exclude the conception of a world order but can be accommodated to it.

The same thing holds good with the conception of miracles of providence. If we speak of divine providence, in doing so we are not necessarily thinking of incidents which break into the connection of events in the world. We may have instead the idea that in natural events God is able to accomplish His purposes. We speak of providence when any sort of natural event has such significance for our life that we seem to recognize in it the will of God. The decisive factor in belief in providence is therefore the personal impression which we have of an event, but this personal impression of the event in question does not wholly exclude its "natural" happening.

In the conception of the miracles of creation and in the conception of miracles of providence we thus have to do with types of miracle in which the idea of an interruption of natural law does not arise. Now we do not

wish to deny that there are such miracles outside the complex of natural events, miracles in which we have to do with a special type of events which either meet us in connection with a natural happening or are to be explained from the connection of natural happening. Such miracles are certainly found in the miracles of salvation and in the miracles of prayer. But the main question is this: since we are speaking of miracles of creation and miracles of providence, it is quite clear that violation of natural law can not be in this case a general mark of the conception of miracle. It is not an essential part of the conception of miracle that we have to do with a violation of natural law. Were this so, this formula would be valid for all miracles; and this is not true.

But to this negative principle we must add immediately its positive amplification. We are to ask ourselves what after all is the positive interest of Christianity in the conception of miracle. We can answer this question if we start by taking up these miracles that are not at least concerned with a violation of natural law. I mean the miracles of creation and providence.

What do we mean when we speak of miracles of creation and providence? Answering first negatively: in doing so we have no intention of giving an explanation of the world. We do not mean to say that we regard God as the cause of the existence of the world and what happens in it. This is impossible, of course, in the world of phenomena. The conception of cause is a conception of the understanding. Therefore it always belongs solely in the sphere of natural scientific knowledge.

But even apart from this epistemological ground, through the idea of a divine cause of the world we would fail to attain any widening and deepening of our knowledge. The effect can only be understood from the cause if the cause is known to us. Now the world is known to us, and not God. So we should be trying to understand an

effect which we know by means of a cause which we do not know. But this is altogether absurd.

By terming God the Creator we do not see in Him the cause of the world. On the contrary, the conception of creation has so little the purpose of making the existence of the world a rational quantum that rather the conception of creation brings before us exactly the irrational character of the world. By calling the world a creation of God we rather mean to say that the fact of the world's existence appears not as something conceptually necessary but as the free act of a reasoning will. So it is not the conception of cause but the conception of will through which we determine the relation of God to the world.

And now we have attained the distinctive mark of the conception of miracle. We have to do with the idea of miracle generally where a free act of the divine will seems present to us. By using this definition we can now go on and apply it to the actual understanding of the different kinds of miracle in the New Testament.

If we think of God as the cause of the world we should only be able to reach the conception of the miracle of creation and the conception of the miracle of providence. By positing God as cause by reason of the existence of the world we speak of the miracle of creation. And by positing God as cause by reason of the process of events in the world we speak of the wonders of providence. Under these circumstances it is quite impossible to show how we could attain the conception of the knowledge of the miracles of salvation. What is left after we have placed God in relation both to the existence of the world as well as to what happens in it? It is altogether impossible for us to find any relation at all suitable for the conception of the miracles of salvation.

It is quite different if we regard the world as an act of God, *i.e.* reflect on the relation of the divine will to the world. Immediately the miracles of creation signify that they bring to our consciousness the cause of the

divine will and the miracles of providence that they give us an impression of the wisdom of the divine will. But when we speak of the might and wisdom of the divine will we only learn to know partially the divine will. The question is forced upon us, what after all is the content of this almighty will? In regard to the content of the divine will we made no affirmation when we spoke of creation and providence.

As to the will, however, it is always essential that it has a definite content. There is no such thing as a will without a definite content. If we desire to speak, therefore, on the basis of events in the world, of a divine will, there must be in connection with these events a particular type of event by which is revealed to us the content of the divine will. And with this event we have to do in the so-called history of salvation. It follows from this that the events from which we recognize the salvation activity of God must differ essentially from all other types of events. But yet, on the other hand, it is just as true that in the case of the saving activity of God there is no suspension of the laws of nature.

We possess a certain analogy to this relation of the divine will to the natural course of events in the world in the sphere of the human will. The saving activity of God is related to the creative activity of God as the content of the will is to those laws of the will according to which the will attains the realization of its content. In the human will, too, we distinguish the technical rules of its action from the proper content of the will without bringing about any contradiction between the two. In the same way there exists between the saving activity of God and His creative action no opposition, though in the case of this saving activity there is something absolutely new and different in respect to His creative activity.

The interest we have in the miracles of salvation is to be looked for in the fact that with this assumption we can speak of a personal will of God. With the conception

of creation and providence we do not advance beyond the idea of an impersonal power. These two conceptions are also common to deism; to a certain extent even pantheism accepts them. But in opposition to deism and pantheism we have no possibility of upholding Christianity in its peculiar character if we do not maintain that in the history of salvation we come to know the personal will of God. And the sequence of events in which the personal will of God is revealed must differ from that type of event which only serves as the means and instrument of the divine will.

These considerations also are capable of being applied practically when we come to discuss the origin of belief in the miraculous on the part of the individual. The analysis outlined above harmonizes with the historical record of man's salvation when the miracles connected with that record are introduced, for they are a type of miracle by which belief in a personal God, as Christians understand it, is constantly stimulated. The reverse of this is also true. There is no general theory by the use of which we can show with finality that the separate miracle narratives in the Bible are trustworthy. Rather, the important point is whether we get from them the impression that we discover in the events accompanying them the personal will of God. In the same way we can only count upon the miracles of prayer when this type of prayer presents itself to us as an experience in the history of our personal communion with God.

The Fact of the Resurrection of Jesus

By Dr. Max Meinertz,

Professor at the University of Münster, in Westphalia.

Since the days of the Apostles the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus lives in Christendom as one of the most important of the facts on which the Christian religion is based, a fact which has helped it essentially to its victorious course through the world. The brightest star of primitive Christianity, the Apostle Paul, who could say that he had laboured more than all the other Apostles of the Gospel (I Cor. 15:10), knows already that he is in exceptional degree under the influence of this fact of the Resurrection and of its significance for missionary preaching. "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain",[1] and recently a man who has little in common with the ideas of the Apostle Paul, one who belonged among the founders of modern criticism of the Gospel, David Friedrich Strauss, expressed himself thus in his polemic *The Halves and the Whole*,[2] "The centre of the centre, the real heart of Christianity is the Resurrection of Jesus."

Now, in our time there is a growing number of persons who do not wish to admit this. They probably admit that in the past belief in the Resurrection did play an important, even a central part, but at the same time they think they should emphasize that modern Chris-

[1] I Cor. 15:13 *sq.*

[2] *Die Halben und die Ganzen, Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 226. Bonn, 1877.

tianity can no longer bear the fact in an historic sense, and that we may therefore understand the Resurrection of Jesus only in a somewhat symbolical sense. So one of the spokesmen in this field in our day, Arnold Meyer of Zurich, begins his book on the Resurrection of Jesus[3] with the words: "The Resurrection of Christ was from the beginning a central point of Christian evangelization, a main part of Christian faith." But through his investigation he claims to have destroyed the bases of this faith and thinks himself justified in uttering the words, "Now if Christ, the image of the personality of Jesus, walks with us in the body, is He really risen? In living men of flesh and blood, in their going to and fro, their business, their associations, His way of life and nobility must have gained form and tangible reality, if more than His name and His fame is to survive. Of that reality, in spite of all imperfections, there has happily never been lack, and thereby what Jesus was and is has really risen and walks among us, while every other way in which Christ may be attainable and visible for us is but fantasy and emotion which offers no sort of pledge of reality and inner truth. We have then the thing, and we need neither the image nor the story, true or legendary of His past Resurrection."[4]

Even among modern Protestant scholars of conservative tendency the fact of the bodily Resurrection seems often, if not denied, at least given little prominence. Recently a critical theologian so felt the lack of a decisive and unambiguous confession of this by one of the "positive" scholars that he expressed his surprise at it.[5] Other conservative Protestant theologians[6] seem, how-

[3] *Die Auferstehung Christi* in *Lebensfragen*, edited by H. Weinel. Tübingen, 1905.

[4] *Op. Cit.*, p. 326 *sq.*

[5] Brückner, in *Theologische Rundschau*, Vol. 16, p. 379 (1913).

[6] For instance, Riggenbach, *Die Auferstehung Jesu* in *Biblische Zeit und Streitfragen*, I: 5. Berlin-Gross-Lichterfelde, 1905; and Ihmels, *Die Auferstehung Jesu*, 3d Ed. Leipzig, 1913.

ever, in no way disposed to break a lance for the objective fact of the Resurrection and to bring out its true importance.

The Catholic Church has held the bodily Resurrection from the first, and has regarded it in the Pauline sense as a fundamental of positive Christianity. Of course she does not in the least miss the symbolical significance of the dogma of the Resurrection; she emphasizes always, loudly and clearly, that the image of the Saviour must be visible in the life of every individual Christian, yes, must be ever more and more ingrained there; but she believes that this does not exhaust the significance of the Lord's Resurrection, nay, rather, that the bodily Resurrection is the basis on which the religious and moral life of the Christian can build. The whole dogmatic structure of Catholicism, the mystic life of grace of the members of the Church, is inconceivable without the bodily Resurrection of Jesus. And so the Church would be surrendering herself were she to meet half way any weakening of the central clause in her creed. In this regard the so-called Syllabus of Pius X simply takes the Catholic credal position when it denies the proposition (No. 36), "The Resurrection of Christ is not properly a fact of the historical order, but a fact, neither proved nor provable, of a purely supernatural order, which Christian consciousness has deduced from other elements."

The Catholic position is, of course, to be held only if it can be historically justified, for on Catholic principles it is quite impossible that a fact which has no basis in history or even must be rejected by history can have any sort of import for the conviction of faith. Modern criticism believes that it has taken from under men's feet the basis of belief in the Resurrection of Jesus. But it may well be asked whether a quiet, unpartisan interpretation of the sources does really imperatively demand a surrender to the arguments of criticism, or

whether one may live on in the assurance that the foundation remains still steadfast and capable of carrying all necessary burdens.

First, perhaps we may call attention to a thought of fundamental importance which has often been discussed and interpreted in quite different ways. It concerns the question, What can the historian expect to prove here with his scientific criteria? The assertion is often freely ventured nowadays that the Resurrection of Jesus was a marvellous event which went beyond the bounds of natural phenomena, and therefore is incapable of scientific demonstration. This view contains, in my opinion, a well justified thought. For the Resurrection in itself, that is, the issuing of the resurrected body from the closed tomb, can have happened only in a miraculous way and was seen by none. Therefore we have naturally no historical account of it. If the Gospels speak of the opening of the rock tomb, the purpose is far from their thought to indicate by that the instant of the Resurrection. This last had, on the contrary,—as the context lets us clearly see that the narrator thought,—already happened when the grave was opened. The opening is only to exhibit the fact of emptiness *from without.* To describe the moment of the Resurrection was reserved for the later apocryphal legend, and we shall have presently to point out the significance from the negative side of this apocryphal story.

So far it is correct to say that the Resurrection as such eludes historical proof. But that does not at all signify that the investigator must from now on quite give up the thought of approaching belief in the Resurrection from the historic side. If he keeps himself free from subjective constructions and lets the records work on him, he will find that from the first belief in the Resurrection was general among the adherents of Jesus. And more: It can be established that on the first day of that week which followed the historically unquestioned death

on the Cross on Friday in the Jewish Passover, the Disciples who had been cast down, asserted that the Risen Lord had appeared to them, that further on that day the tomb was found empty, and that all efforts failed to explain its being empty in a natural way. If, then, we can make it further probable that among the closest adherents of Jesus the spiritual disposition was lacking which would have made it possible for them to imagine a coming to life again so soon after a shameful death, that belief in the Resurrection, in spite of all outward hindrances, spiritually transformed the ancient world and even to this day holds in itself unconquerable forces of life, then the premises are given on which the historian must form his judgment of the actuality. But since an event of an extraordinary kind is involved, an event that leaves all human analogies behind, it must naturally be demanded that each individual link in the chain of argument be especially strongly forged.

One should not lose sight either of a consideration that Father Rose once expressed in these words,[7] "The apologist who would lead an unprepared mind to the tomb of Jesus would be inexperienced and even naïve. To get in touch with Jesus Christ Himself, to study His doctrine, examine His conscience, and the worth of the testimony that that Man gave regarding His divine origin, these seem to us to be the first steps for one who is urged to believe. . . . Then only will meditation beside the tomb found empty become fruitful."

Of course it must not be forgotten that just at this stage the general point of view of the investigator plays no unimportant part. Above all, there is the decisive question whether an event like the bodily Resurrection which bursts the bonds of natural phenomena is possible at all. The Catholic investigator, for instance, reckons it a necessary condition of the theistic conception of God that the Creator of the world stands above natural

[7] *Etude sur les Evangiles*, p. 32 *sq.* Paris, 1904.

laws and from higher motives can produce an effect that surpasses the power of natural laws. He sees in this no actual violation of the natural order, but only the removal for a specific case of a natural effect by a Cause that has created the natural law, when thereby some especially important end is to be effected. This fundamental point of view is naturally the *conditio sine qua non* for the acceptance of the bodily Resurrection of Jesus. But he who admits the possibility of such a miracle is *a priori* in a more favourable position than the investigator who denies the possibility in advance. For in the latter case he *cannot* recognize the Resurrection at all in its reality and must, therefore, try as best he can to settle his account with the Resurrection narrative. On the other hand, he who takes his stand on the possibility is free in either direction. He can assent, but he can also reject, since possibility alone does not of course imply actuality. For this one there exists at most the danger that he may admit the actuality too quickly and too hastily, without having sufficiently tested the facts. In this case he would of course commit a serious error in method. But if he guards himself from this and advances with methodic security, he draws his conclusions of fact only from what he has established historically. He yields himself, then, even in such a case as the Resurrection of Jesus, simply to the facts. And although this is a case of a supernatural, miraculous event, he does not act essentially differently than he would in the investigation of every other event of past history. To be sure, he no longer approaches the event itself in a questioning spirit. He examines the witnesses who tell anything of what happened, or of its effects, he tests their credibility, and then passes his judgment.

In our case the number of witnesses from the first Christian century is not small, for we have the classic testimony of the Apostle Paul and the accounts of the canonical evangelists, and I wish especially to emphasize

that the testimony of the Gospel of John is more and more recognized today, even in critical quarters, and that the modern attempts to separate out from the present text of this Gospel an earlier source, which possibly may itself go back to the Apostle John, are consciously or unconsciously produced by some such thought as this. There is in the Gospel of John too much obviously historical material to permit one simply to put it aside. If, then, one does not wish to recognize the historical credibility of the whole, one is constrained from this point of view to accept at least an historically reliable source. Great reliance is to be placed as a matter of course on the synoptic accounts, especially since they stand so closely connected with the evidentially valuable story of the Passion.

Now against all efforts to discredit these accounts it is to be urged that the Gospels, with all their deviations in detail, agree wholly and fully in the decisive main thing. All four chronicles tell of the death of Jesus on the Cross, of His burial in a rock tomb, then further, of the discovery of the empty grave on the first day of the week by the grieving women and of the appearances of the Risen, together with His teachings by which the Apostles, hesitating at first, were brought to a firm faith in the bodily Resurrection.

Arnold Meyer understands very well, as D. Fr. Strauss and many other critics did before him, how to bring out effectively the differences between the separate narratives. But one who goes through his expositions carefully and weighs the separate narratives against each other will come, in my opinion, to the conclusion that the contradictions alleged are often so very attenuated that many of the differences are quite comprehensible on psychological grounds, and, above all, that the differences in detail need not impair the credibility of the general narrative. Indeed, one may well assert the opposite. Precisely through the idiosyncrasies of the separate

narratives the agreement in the central matter comes more clearly to view. For from this we may infer a certain independence in the narration, which builds on varying traditions, which bubbles up from manifold springs, and so, in spite of all the friction in parts, does not sacrifice its independence. In this connection attention has already been repeatedly called to a remark of the critically judicious Lessing[8] which has direct reference to the Resurrection narrative, and really deserves to be taken to heart, "If Livy and Polybius and Dionysius and Tacitus had told of the same event, for instance, the same battle, the same siege, each with such differing details that the details of one absolutely contradict the details of the other, has anyone on that account ever denied the event itself on which they agreed? . . . If now Livy and Dionysius and Polybius and Tacitus are treated so frankly and honourably by us that we do not bring them to the rack for every syllable, why then not as well Matthew and Mark and Luke and John?"

To explain the divergent accounts of the Resurrection one must keep in mind the obvious truth that the narrative of the Gospels must not be judged by the standards that the modern historian applies to an historic description. Ancient history knows nothing at all of the modern demands of the genetic study of history, with the working up of the whole material that stands at the historian's disposition. Measured by this standard, none of the Gospel would stand the test. Consider, for instance, the framework of the life of Jesus in Matthew. Can one speak here of a biography of Jesus at all? Certainly not. There are only fragments of His life, often arranged according to subject, to the neglect of the natural succession. Only the story of the Passion receives a chronological, connected, consecutive presentation, but

[8] *Ein Duplik*, p. 25 *sq.* in *Collected Works*, Vol. 13. Leipzig, 1897.

here again without entire completeness. To be sure, Matthew's Gospel is planned with remarkable delicacy from the pragmatically artistic point of view, so much so that Theodor Zahn[9] does not shrink from the statement that in all ancient literature he does not know anything worthy to stand beside it for grandeur of conception and mastery through great thoughts of a mighty theme. But such a work of art, implying the precipitate of preaching and aiming at religious instruction, does not at all satisfy the demands of a modern historical work. The separate accounts need not for that reason be less trustworthy, but in accordance with this tendency, they are often incomplete, and make the reconstruction of the connections difficult.

The same applies also to one of the chief differences in the relation of the appearances of the Risen, namely, the statement of the place of these appearances. While Luke's Gospel tells of appearances only in and near Jerusalem, and John, except for a postscript in the 21st Chapter, follows the same lines, Matthew closes with an appearance to the Disciples on a mountain in Galilee. Attempts have been made to explain this peculiarity on quite divergent lines, most originally by those who have denied that there is any need to suppose that the Galilee mentioned in Matthew is the Northern Palestinian region, and have expressed their own belief that the district east of Jerusalem is meant, to which the Mount of Olives also belonged. This attempt at a solution is, to be sure, as simple as Columbus' egg, but its postulates cannot be proved, so it builds in the air. But such a radical solution is by no means necessary if the points of view which have just been established for the nature of Gospel writing are kept in mind. It does not at all concern the evangelist to offer a complete account of the event after the laying of the Lord in the grave. He

[9] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Vol. 2, Part 3, p. 292. Leipzig, 1907.

seeks only according to the tenor of the whole work to crown his Gospel with a grandiose concluding picture. Since throughout his presentation Jesus is ever present as Messias and as Founder of the Messianic kingdom; as in the very beginning of his Gospel he indicates that the Messianic kingdom is a universal kingdom, extending far beyond the boundaries of Israel, so from the facts of the Resurrection he selects that one which must best serve his apologetic purpose. In that region which saw most of the Saviour during His work on earth, as the counterpart to the giving of the law for the new kingdom on the hill of the Sermon on the Mount, we hear now the Risen speak the weighty world-historic words, Go, and make disciples of all nations; and then this missionary command reaches its final note in the promise of unending succour.

From this point of view, according to the purpose of Matthew's Gospel, it was not necessary to narrate as conclusion the ascent into Heaven of the Risen,—Klostermann[10] puts it in this way, Matthew suppresses the Ascension purposely in view of the parting words that he had given,—nor was it necessary to tell also the separate appearances in and near Jerusalem or others in Galilee. Matthew (28:9, 10) mentions besides an appearance to the women in Jerusalem on the day of Resurrection in brief words, against the genuineness of which no convincing argument is to be adduced, and he implies at least one other to the Apostles (28:16). Really it seems to me simply outrageous that anyone should pretend to assert that Matthew *knew* nothing of other appearances besides those of which he told. And this view would become ever more discredited the deeper one sought to explore the date of composition of that Gospel. For even before the 60's a great number of appearances was a recognized fact in the Christian congregations,

[10] Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 2, *Die Evangelien*, Part 1, p. 355. Tübingen, 1909.

among them, those of Palestine, as the narrative of the Apostle Paul makes clear and obvious.

Starting from this consideration, nothing stands in the way of the assumption that the appearances were more numerous than have left any trace at all in the sources accessible to us. The oral preaching of ancient times may have told of much besides that was not written down. So, for instance, there is an old tradition that Jesus appeared also to His Mother. To this opinion there is the less objection because in the New Testament Mary is in general treated with tender reserve. It is, to be sure, generally objected to the historicity of this tradition that it may well have sprung solely from the tendency to glorify Mary. But recently the effort was made by a critical historian[11] to show the probable existence of the tradition in the New Testament itself. The Johannine story of the appearance to Mary Magdalen (20:1 *sq.*) is claimed to have been told in the original text of the Mother of Jesus. Proof, to be sure, failed,[12] but the possibility remains that the oldest witness for this transfer, Tatian the Assyrian, besides harmonizing reasons, experienced the influence of an oral tradition that the first appearance of the Risen had been granted to His Mother. But leaving that aside, in any case the main difference between the accounts of the scene of the appearances finds its solution quite naturally in the literary intent of the Gospels themselves, without giving one a right to find the separate accounts in irreconcilable conflict with one another. And whatever differences remain, in view of the agreement in essentials, not

[11] Albertz, *Ueber die Christophanie der Mutter Jesu* in *Theologische Studium und Kritiken*, for 1913, pp. 483, 516.

[12] Here it may be briefly noted that the critical evidence of the addition Μαγδαληνή to Μαρία in John 20:1 is too strong to be shaken by the arguments of Albertz which are in themselves not convincing. Besides, decisive evidence appears against the attribution of the passage to the Mother of Jesus in (1) the address Μαριάμ (20:16), and (2) the fact that always elsewhere in John's Gospel Mary is called the Mother of Jesus and never by her name.

only need not shake the credibility of the facts but they even add, as has been said, to the independent value of the testimony. Every experienced psychologist, above all, every examining magistrate, will recognize also how hard it is to get from different witnesses statements agreeing exactly in all details, even when the fact as such is certain, and the wish to make true statements is present. Now we have, besides the canonical evangelists, the account of the Apostle to the Gentiles, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (15:1 *sq.*), the critical importance of which is generally recognized. And rightly! Paul appears here, indeed, as witness to the tradition, and besides it can be proved with certainty that the content of his testimony can be carried back to direct contact with the events themselves. This is so much the more important since Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians speaks of the Resurrection of no set purpose, almost incidentally, which implies that he took the facts simply out of the treasure of the generally recognized tradition. The accidental circumstance that in the newly converted congregation at Corinth doubts were expressed about the resurrection of the dead gave the Apostle occasion to express his mind on this matter. And since the Resurrection of Jesus is the prototype and the guarantee for the resurrection of the dead, Paul was led to discuss this doctrine that seemed to him so important. It is evident that in such connection he will naturally offer no detailed description of the event as the evangelists do,—these were sufficiently familiar to Christians through oral preaching. He takes from the story only what seems evidentially important for his purpose and *reminds* his congregation of it.

The simple words of I Cor. 15:3–11 appeal with emphasis to tradition. Paul said nothing new to his Christians. If he spoke of the Resurrection of Jesus, he simply preached what he himself knew from apostolic tradition, and the Corinthians, too, accepted the truths in faith.

It makes no difference whether Paul or the other Apostles preach the Resurrection, it is always the same doctrine. Now we know that Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians about the year 56. Further, that the first facts of the preaching of the Resurrection at Corinth was in the year 50–51,—the Gallio inscription at Delphi permits the date to be fixed with certainty. But since the question as he so strongly emphasized is of an original Apostolic tradition, the preaching at Corinth corresponds precisely to that which was proclaimed on the preceding missionary journey, that is, of course, to what Paul had heard soon after his conversion from the original Apostles. Thus we are brought back to the time when the persecutor of Christians was converted into the Apostle of Jesus. Nowadays a tendency is asserting itself among scholars to place the conversion in the very year of Jesus' death, or at least immediately after. I regard this chronological conclusion as erroneous, but it is certain that we may not assume an interval of more than five or six years. Hence it is evident that soon after the death of Jesus the belief in the Resurrection was widespread, that the angry enemy of Christians, and surely not therefore credulous, St. Paul, was overcome by its truth, that its actuality was preached by him, just as by the original Apostles with one accord and with declared emphasis, to Jew and Gentile. How strongly the Resurrection was felt from the first to be a fundamental element of Christian faith appears also from the fact that in the Corinthian passage just mentioned part of what is said has already a formal sound, and probably therefore had already developed itself into a real confession of faith.

What has been said is an observation of the very first importance, and it is probably not misunderstood in its significance among critics. But still the statement of the Apostle is quite often misinterpreted. Critics frequently, one is almost tempted to say, overemphasize it by as-

serting that under these circumstances Paul's statement must be supposed to contain all that was originally known about the Resurrection of Jesus. And yet if one considers the connection which I have just explained, one will easily see that the Apostle selects only what must have been most important for him at the moment, and this in the nature of the case was the appearances through which the Risen proved Himself alive before the most credible authorities, or else before an imposing number of witnesses together. If, then, single appearances of which the Gospels tell are passed over in the Corinthian passage, that does not show at all that Paul did not know them, still less, that they are unhistorical. "It is his way", says E. von Dobschütz[13] rightly, "when he adduces historical happenings to bring forward only the most important." Above all, it must not surprise that the appearances to the women are entirely omitted. Of course it would be absurd to say that Paul had despised testimony from that quarter or regarded it as unworthy of credence. But one may well consider that their testimony should give place in relation to the important witnesses cited, the more since, shortly before (I Cor. 14:34) stood the phrase *Mulieres in ecclesiis taceant*, and the emphasis here is on the *preaching* of the Gospel message. Note, too, that in John 21:14 only the appearances to the Apostles are mentioned, although the one to Magdalen had been told by that evangelist himself.

And now comes a further, very important, consideration. In the Corinthian passage no less than five appearances (six with that to Paul himself) of the Risen are mentioned, while no Gospel tells of so many appearances. Among them is the revelation to more than five hundred brethren. This great number naturally spread the story of their experience; indeed, at the time of the composition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, most of them, according to Paul's statement, were still alive,

[13] *Ostern und Pfingsten*, p. 37. Leipzig, 1903.

and that is true also of the 60's in which at the latest the Synoptic Gospels were written,—Harnack too now puts them all before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. An insurance company a few years ago made a very instructive calculation of probabilities which is pertinent here.[14] According to this, out of 500 persons, taken at the age of thirty, there will survive after thirty years, 336, after thirty-five years, 277. Following this calculation, of the 500 brethren who saw the appearances in the year 30, considerably more than 300 would have been alive at the beginning of the 60's, and in the middle of that decade, still more than half of them.

If all this is considered, it is, in view of our passage from the Corinthians, as I have already shown, a monstrous assumption that the evangelists could possibly have failed to learn of the appearance to the five hundred just because they do not tell it. Yes, in absolute opposition to the generally recognized principles of legendary accretion, one would have, if this were really a case of legend, to assume that in the oldest tradition the greatest number of appearances is to be found, while later the number decreases. Elsewhere legend shows a fondness for exaggeration. In this instance Friedrich Loofs of Halle[15] has once for all admirably reduced the scruples of the critics to the absurd. "Suppose", he says, "we had simply the statement of I Cor. 15:1–8, The Lord appeared first to Peter, then to the Twelve, then to more than five hundred brethren, then to James, then to all the apostles; and then suppose further that these statements had come to us anonymously in a papyrus. Then the debate about them would start with the question, On what plane of secondary production these stories should be placed. Critics would say, Mark refers only

[14] See Th. Korff, *Die Auferstehung Christi und die radikale Theologie*, p. 110. Halle, a. S. 1908.

[15] *Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert*, 3d Ed., p. 10. Tübingen, 1908.

to Galilee, Matthew has two appearances, Luke even three,—here there are already five; besides, there is the purely formal mention of the Twelve against the historical 'eleven' of Luke (34:33), the five hundred brethren are called in to banish every doubt by their multitude. . . . —in short, the whole story is obviously a very secondary construction. But now, as it happens, these statements are by the Apostle Paul. Ought that not to make the critics modest?" Once for all, the fact stands historically established that from the first with clear and frank unanimity, even in Jerusalem, the scene of the Passion and Death of Jesus, the Resurrection of Jesus was believed and preached. The Acts, too, furnish numerous proofs of this. A man like Harnack recognizes the fact without circumlocution. But since, for reasons growing out of something else than historical research, that is, on account of his conception of the world, he can not make up his mind to accept the bodily Resurrection, he declares in one place,[16] "The fixation of primitive Christian tradition in the Acts, where it has to do with the appearances of the Crucified and what immediately followed, stands quite under the spell of a legend that grew with almost inconceivable rapidity." Really, one might as well just leave out that little word "almost", for truly one stands here before a riddle, if one thinks himself obliged to cancel out of the realm of reality the fact of the Resurrection.

A man's conception of the world does, in fact, play a decisive part in the rejection of the Resurrection. But then he must settle his account in some way or other with the hard reality. This has been already tried in various ways. The time is, to be sure, past in scientific investigation when people thought they could explain the Resurrection in the coarse or naïve form of deception or revival of one apparently dead. It would not be worth while even to allude to this if some medical authors

[16] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 224. Leipzig, 1906.

(Jafka, Streffe) had not very recently roused again to life the hypothesis of apparent death.[17] There is no pretence among these most modern writers of any examination of the sources, and even apart from this, the often cited remark with which D. Fr. Strauss[18] overthrew the hypothesis of apparent death applies to them. "A half-dead person, just crept from the grave, slinking about, needing medical attention, bandaging, strengthening and care, and dying at last of his sufferings, could not possibly have made on the Disciples the impression which lay at the base of their future behaviour, of the Victor over death and the grave, of the Prince of Life. Such an awakening to life could only have weakened the impression which He had made on them in life and death, could at best give it an elegiac close, but could by no possibility have transformed their mourning to enthusiasm and have exalted their reverence to worship."

The main stream of scientifically working critical theology passes over such banal attempts at explanation to the order of the day, and tries then to work out on its side a deepened, more psychological conception of faith in the Resurrection. With all differences in individual explanation, the critics come to the common result that the Apostles had an inner experience, a vision, which made itself objective in their consciousness and evoked the conviction that the executed and buried Jesus of Nazareth was alive. Arnold Meyer thinks he can find a disposition to such visions in the supposition that the Disciples immediately after the arrest of Jesus fled to Galilee in depression and confusion of spirit; that there, with the quieting of their nerves, the original deep impression of the personality of Jesus was revived; that then the conviction that Jesus must be alive first burst

[17] Compare, Leipoldt in *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, Vol. 46, pp. 578, 582 (1913), and *Vom Jesusbilde der Gegenwart*, pp. 197 *sq.* Leipzig, 1913.

[18] *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, I: 4, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 378. Bonn, 1877.

its way into the mind of Peter in an inner experience, and that this conviction soon became contagious and forced itself on the other adherents of the Lord as well.

Now, this fabric is shipwrecked in advance, for it has not a basis strong enough to support anything. The hypothesis of a flight of the Apostles to Galilee immediately after the arrest of Jesus is not only not noted in the sources or even hinted there, but contradicts all conditions, psychologic and external, above all, the strictly observed Jewish rule for the hallowing of the Sabbath on which a long journey was forbidden.

These weighty objections to the hypothesis of flight are frequently felt to be inescapable among critics, and so we note that Johannes Weiss[19] in a keen polemic against the radical Socialist, Maurenbrecher,[20] rejects the whole hypothesis absolutely. He seeks, for his part, to put in the foreground the personal impression of Jesus which let the conviction arise among the Apostles after the death, "He is the Messiah still, and cannot have remained in death."

But, precisely from Weiss's own point of view, it can be proved that the road from personal impression to faith in the bodily Resurrection of Jesus leads over cliffs that can never be surmounted. Weiss emphasizes strongly that, according to the Jewish conception, the Messias did not necessarily belong to the expected dawn of the Kingdom of God. If, then, faith in the Messianic dignity of Jesus had collapsed among the Apostles at the catastrophe of Golgotha, and if they, being natures strongly subject to religious impressions, had not lost together with this the expectation of a coming Kingdom of God, then the belief in the Kingdom of God could have continued without the Messias when their storm-tossed minds had grown calm. Wellhausen once used this metaphor,

[19] *Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums*, in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 16, pp. 423–515 (1913). Compare, pp. 461 *sq.*

[20] *Von Nazareth nach Golgotha*, pp. 215 *sq.* Berlin, 1909.

Through the death of Jesus the spring which caused an inner tension in the Disciples was drawn back and then this spring was released again from some cause that can no longer be precisely explained. But this comparison does not quite fit. It must, that is, be taken into account that for a Jew of that time the conception of a suffering and dying Messias was something absolutely unheard of. Even then the comparison is admissible only with the change that the spring was not "drawn back" but broken.

The personal impression made by Jesus is naturally to be recognized. Indeed, it is in quite unpsychological fashion that it has been put in the background by Maurenbrecher, but it makes a vast difference whether we suppose that the lofty, pure and noble image of the Master gradually emerged in the soul of the Apostles, or that the *Messianic* thought could present itself again. And faith in the Resurrection is precisely the renewed affirmation of Messiahship. But according to what has been said a reawakening of the Messianic thought cannot be supposed without some objective event, external to the consciousness of the Disciples. And further: The impression of the personality of Jesus from the time of His association with His Disciples is surely to be reckoned great. But still, is it probable that the transition from deepest psychic shock could be effected in the short time from Friday evening to Sunday? And, even if one chose to admit that improbability, How did it come about that the personal impression immediately took shape in belief in a bodily resurrection? Let no one say that belief in resurrection was a quite current conception among the Jews. We have to do here with a concrete case, why just in this instance the personal impression should develop the conviction of a premature resurrection. It would have been quite enough and would have been the most obvious thing that the impression should have taken the form of a spiritual living-on, as

the patriarchs lived on in the memory of Israel or the prophets in their writings. Neither can the prophecies by Jesus of His own Resurrection be used in explanation (Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19), the more as their historicity is for the most part contested by the critics. In any case, they made notoriously no impression on the Apostles. Whether they took them at first symbolically, or whatever they may have thought about them, the fact is that the catastrophe on Golgotha was not illuminated in any way by the prophecies, but that in this case, too, an understanding of the prediction was first taught by its fulfilment.

To all these considerations no satisfactory answer has yet been made by those who contest the fact of the Resurrection. And this becomes even less possible if it be further considered how little the Apostles were disposed to subjective visions. A vision arises then only when the content of the image lies hidden already in some fashion in the consciousness of the visionary. But if this had been the case with the Disciples, how is it explicable that for the most part they did not know the Risen, yes, still more, that they doubted and feared? Such behaviour contradicts the inmost nature of a subjective vision. And then comes, besides, the appearance to more than five hundred brethren. As has been already emphasized, this finds its place precisely in the statement of the Apostle Paul, which in the critical view is of especial value. But what an improbability is implied in the thought of a crowd-suggestion! We are dealing here clearly with a time when the Disciples in Galilee had already overcome the first terrors of the Crucifixion scene, so that nervous excitement as a disposing cause to visionary conceptions is no longer in question. If crowd-suggestions from history are brought into comparison, it will be found that these are connected with excitements of the multitude. Nothing of that sort occurs in the biblical narrative. Quite the contrary, at

the time when a certain religious excitement can be proved, that is, at the descent of the Holy Spirit on the first Whitsunday, or in the worshipping congregation at Corinth, visions are wholly lacking. In this connection the thought already expressed may be emphasized, that stories of vision multiply in legend, while here they are limited to a brief time, and then wholly cease.

The mighty missionary preaching as well as the numberless sufferings and persecutions which the Apostles had to endure surely do not leave the impression that we have to do here with visionaries. It has been rightly called notable[21] that a conviction that rested on more or less ecstatic conditions could hardly have made of the Disciples such sober, efficient men.

It is then quite unsatisfactory to try to explain the Apostles' belief in the Resurrection from subjective visions. The appearances maintain their significance for the actuality of the Resurrection, and as a supplement, if I may use the expression, there comes also the negative proof from the fact of the empty grave. With this fact, of course, the bodily Resurrection stands or falls. For of material appearances of the Risen there can naturally be no question if the body of Jesus mouldered in the grave. Now there is, in fact, here too, a group of critical theologians, with Arnold Meyer at their head, who deny the fact of the empty grave, in spite of the unanimous declaration of the sources. To me, however, this seems one of the most forced attempts at explanation that has ever been undertaken. And it is to be recognized that other critics no longer follow on that road. Just consider the situation a moment. A few weeks after the death and burial of Jesus the Apostles appear in public, on the very scene of these events, and declare, The grave is empty, the Crucified is risen from the dead. Above all, let one consider from this angle of vision the speech that the Apostle Peter, according to

[21] Ihmels, *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi*, p. 335.

Acts 2:14 made in Jerusalem on the day of the descent of the Holy Spirit. He speaks there of Jesus who had been nailed to the Cross and then been raised from the dead. To give a vivid idea of such an unheard-of event he directs attention to a passage from the 16th Psalm of King David which says among other things that God will not suffer His Holy One to see corruption; and then the preacher reasons further that he may apply the words to the Messias. "Brethren, let me freely speak to you of the Patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Thus Peter contrasts the generally known grave of the great Israelite King with the grave of the Messias Jesus. One shows the place where the body of the King rests, the other the place where the Messias was laid only for a brief sleep of death. Would such a sermon in the centre of Judaism not have been a presumption and a folly, if any one of the hearers could have replied, The grave of Jesus is as much to be seen as the King's grave, and the body is going to its decay, as the royal body has already gone!

But such an objection was not once raised and during the rest of the missionary teaching of the Apostles not one of their numerous Jewish opponents ever thought of embarrassing the missionary by any such objection, indeed, on the contrary, we know that from Jewish quarters the legend was promptly spread that the body of Jesus had been stolen. Even Matthew mentions this (28:12 *sq.*) and Christian apologists of the second century have more to tell (Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon*, 108). Would any one from the Jewish side have stumbled on this evasion, when with it, in any case, the fact of the empty grave was admitted? If they had not stood here before a solid, generally recognized and admitted fact, they would surely not have been so eager to circulate the claim, The teaching of the Resurrection is a lie because the body has long ago mouldered in the grave.

Considerations of such convincing strength have led to the attempt to destroy the argument from the empty grave by suggesting that the body might have been removed in a natural way. In this connection many conjectures have been expressed but, since none were satisfactory, one quickly replaced another. The latest acutely conducted attempt is probably that of H. J. Holtzmann[22] who in connection with an idea that he has expressed elsewhere attributes the active part to Joseph of Arimathea. The biblical account of this Joseph of Arimathea is simple and natural. He is a member of the Sanhedrin, a man of note, probably a native of Arimathea. Since he was convinced of the innocence of Jesus and since His teaching had made a deep impression on him, he wished to prepare an honourable burial for the Master. The Roman procurator, who had the disposal of the body of the executed, had no objection to yield the body to this man of note at his request, and so he buried Him in a rock grave which he had already secured for the use of his own family.

This story, with all its freshness and naturalness, Holtzmann must needs turn upside down to make it available for his purposes. He would have Joseph's relation of disciple to Jesus unhistorical, indeed, Joseph is supposed to have owned no burial place at all in Jerusalem; he simply wished, in view of the Jewish conception of the importance of a respectable burial, to show the last honours to the body of a Jew. But in view of the Sabbath that was just beginning and of the rest connected with that day, they had taken the first chance cave to lay the body in. When the Sabbath was over Joseph had the body conveyed to his home in Arimathea without anyone's knowing anything about it.

This edifice is evidently an arbitrary combination with

[22] *Das leere Grab und die gegenwärtigen Verhandlungen über die Auferstehung Jesu* in *Theologische Rundschau*, Vol. 9 (1906), pp. 79–86, 119–132.

no warrant of historic foundation. But if one cared to admit its credibility, a little reflection would show that it fails to explain the empty grave. To notice but a few objections. What interest could Joseph have had to get the body to Arimathea, when he is supposed to have had no other purpose than to secure a becoming burial for the body of a Jew? And even if that had taken place, there would be the new improbability that no one heard anything about it, although the transfer would hardly have been practicable without the aid of companions, nor was it likely that Joseph, or those who shared his knowledge, should have given no hint of their action in the face of the apostolic preaching of the Resurrection. Although Holtzmann did not offer the detailed argument for his view until after Arnold Meyer had defended his radical thesis, one feels tempted to apply the latter's remark[23] in this connection: "Let us abandon these exhibitions of a playful ingenuity before the stern grave of Jesus on which there still rests the shadow of the Cross,"

Appeal can hardly be made in this connection to the watch at the grave, of which Matthew tells (27:62), since its unhistoricity is usually regarded as axiomatically established. To be sure, the reasons that are alleged against the account seem to have been devised at the writer's desk rather than adapted from conditions of real life. On the one hand, they do not reckon with the great power of money, which helps to overcome many moral considerations, especially if, as is possible, Roman legionaries were not concerned, nor, on the other hand, do they reckon with the fact that regulations which latent fear have produced are not always considered in all their consequences. In any case Harnack[24] indicated his disposition to accept the historicity of the watch at the grave. We have besides statements that later in the

[23] *Op cit.*, p. 119.

[24] *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 108. Leipzig, 1911.

Christian persecutions watch was set over the bodies of the executed.[25]

If the watch at the grave is accepted as historical, it is of course a positive argument against the possibility of understanding the vacating of the grave in a natural way, and so the opinion is re-enforced that all previous attempts to explain its becoming empty have proved themselves inadequate. The fact of the watch at the grave would be insignificant only in case the news of the empty grave had first appeared long after the death of Jesus. But all our sources of information point already to the Sunday after the day of death.

But even the primitive belief, "On the third day he rose from the dead", has also had to abide the fire of criticism. In the first place, critics think they can put it aside by considerations recently drawn from religious history, as, in general, faith in the Resurrection of Jesus is supposed to fall a sacrifice to the facts of the history of religions. To this end critics adduce the mysteries of that syncretic period, in which men feeling the need of redemption took their refuge, if they did not believe that they could satisfy in any other way, or elsewhere, the deepest longing of their hearts. In these mysteries the worship of dying gods that rose again, a Tammuz, Attis, Osiris, Adonis, is said to have been practised and from these the thought of resurrection is said to have been carried over to Christianity.

Now it is of course to be recognized that a conception of resurrection was widespread in heathen circles of that time. But this thought corresponded to the observation of natural processes. In autumn nature dies gradually away, to rise again in new youth in spring. So, too, the sun loses its warming power until it is enabled to beam anew with an increasing glow. This is the annually recurrent resurrection of nature which the myth-making

[25] Compare, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* V, I, 59. (*The Story of the Martyrs at Lyons.*)

instinct applies in one form or another to a god. By secret rites the mystics sought to participate in the destiny of the god, and so in a magic way to share in the redemption.

In these forms of worship we have then to do with the materialization of a natural process which recurs annually and exercises its power through the longing for some redemption, however fashioned. In this the ritual appealing to the senses naturally made the deepest impression while the myth itself with its details stayed in the background.

On the other hand, the Passion of Jesus was told of an earthly Person who had lived but a little while before and with whom the first missionaries had themselves associated. Neither the Passiontide nor the subsequent restoration to life is combined with any sort of mythical element; on the contrary, the events can be understood only against the background of their historical conditions. The biblical narratives contain nothing, absolutely nothing, that could suggest the processes typical of the heathen mysteries. Above all, the characteristic trait was missing that the death of the god should be mourned in passionate sorrow by his beloved. Further, mystery-worship knows no proper burial of the god. To be sure, there was recently found in the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess Athargatis at Rome, a buried cultus-god,[26] but this find belongs to the third century after Christ so that it is natural to conjecture here, what at other points is clearly indicated, that subsequent Christian ideas had influenced the heathen conceptions.

If the Christian idea of resurrection had really had its root already in heathen mythology, it would also have to be shown that the Jewish Messianic idea reckoned at that time with the Passion and Death of the Messias. But just the contrary is the fact. A suffering Messias,

[26]A reproduction is given in *Studi romani*, I, pp. 343–350. Rome, 1913.

that is to say, a Redeemer who through suffering and death attained to resurrection and glorification, was for the Jews an idea almost blasphemous, so Paul could declare (I Cor. 1:23) that the Cross of Christ was for the Jews a stumbling-block. Further, that the missionary preaching of a suffering Redeemer did not affect heathen hearers as a new edition of the mystery-myth appears from the continuation of the just-cited Pauline phrase, "For the heathen the Cross is a folly" [unto the Greeks foolishness].

There is a further consideration. The Jews in Palestine, quite apart from the Messianic idea, were just at this fulness of time not at all susceptible to heathen ideas. Though attention has been called to the fact that an Adonis shrine existed in Bethlehem itself in the alleged birth grotto of the Saviour, the very writer to whom we owe the information, St. Jerome,[27] explains that this sanctuary was not built till the second century after Christ by the Emperor Hadrian, that is, after the destruction of the Jewish nation. And an investigator like Baudissin,[28] recognizing the trustworthiness of this statement, adds the remark, "That the Adonis worship, with its celebration of death and resurrection, may have exercised an influence on the genesis or the form of the Christian belief in the Risen has been repeatedly assumed but proved as yet at no point. No combinations have so far made it probable that in Palestinian Jewish circles, where belief in the Risen was first professed, any conceptions of Adonis worship could have been active." According to this, any talk of borrowing, even in a weakened sense of the word, is to be avoided, and yet some dabblers in religious history think they may go still further, and even explain the tradition of the Resurrection on the third day from mythology. They appeal,

[27] *Epist. 58: 3, ad Paulinum* (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vol. 54, p. 532. See also *Paulinus of Nola, Epist. 31:3, ad Severum* (*ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 270).

[28] *Adonis und Esmun*, p. 522. Leipzig, 1911.

among other things, to the fact that in Rome the mourning for the death of Attis lasted three days, and that on the fourth day the mourning was converted into orgiastic jubilation. But here we have to do with quite a different reckoning of time. Jesus, strictly speaking, was hardly a day and a half in the grave, from Friday evening till early Sunday morning. At most, then, a merely superficial accord with the words, "after three days", could be established. It should be considered also that in the Attis worship the memorial of death and of coming to life again was combined only in the act of worship. But in fact, as has been said, in this nature myth autumn is the time of death, and Johannes Weiss[29] is quite right in saying, "If the death and resurrection were matter of legend, if the gospel tradition could have gone to work unrestrictedly with no compulsion from facts, nothing need have hindered putting the death of Christ in the autumn, His resurrection in the spring."

Motives drawn from the history of religions are, then, not only superfluous but wholly unserviceable for explaining the original tradition of the third day as the day of the Resurrection. The same is true of the alleged Persian conception, according to which the soul stayed three days and three nights near the body and did not come to its destined place till the fourth day. In his study of *The Religion of Judaism in New Testament Times*,[30] Bousset says of this conception that only late and dubious evidences exist for it though recently[31] he seems inclined to accept it. But even if the quite unproved hypothesis that this belief was current among the Jews at the time of Jesus should be conceded, it would surely be a very long step indeed from that conception to the thought of the Resurrection. And further,

[29] *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte*, p. 34. Tübingen, 1910.

[30] *Die Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, p. 341, Note 1. 2d Ed. Berlin, 1906.

[31] *Kyrios Christos*, p. 30 *sq.* Göttingen 1913.

there is the already mentioned difference in the reckoning of time. Here three days and three nights, there hardly more than one day and not quite two nights.

With inventive genius the Old Testament has also been brought in in order to find in it the basis for the "third day". Critics like to recall that passage in the prophet Hosea (6:1, 2), "Come and let us return unto the Lord, for he hath torn and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up, after two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." The thought here in its context is simply that the faithless Israelites are summoned to join themselves again to the Lord, for then He will in the briefest time turn His punishing justice into saving pity. There is no notion of any allusion to the Messias, and the calling back to life of the physically dead is in any case not immediately in the text. The conception, "two" or "three" days, is, on the other hand, used simply plastically for some short interval. So far as we know, no one in old times ever called attention to this passage in the sense of even an indirect Messianic allusion. And if it is considered how gladly and how frequently the New Testament brings in Old Testament phrases to explain happenings in the Messianic time, it becomes absolutely impossible to suppose that the passage in Hosea had any influence on, still less that it evoked, the conception of the Resurrection on the third day.

All artifice fails then to explain the third day from without. But everything, on the contrary, becomes perfectly intelligible, if we trust the sources, according to which the emptiness of the grave on the third day was ascertained and the Risen proved Himself at the same time alive by His appearances. How fully this belief passed in brief time into the consciousness of Christendom is shown by the fact that Christians gave up the Jewish hallowing of the Sabbath, and observed Sunday as a memorial of the Resurrection. And in this festival

there was originally nothing taken over from the historical religions and nothing suggested by a god of light. For, according to the oldest tradition, the actual Resurrection took place before sunrise. Besides, we have to do here, not with the day when the sun awakes to new life out of the apparent sterility of winter, but rather with a season when, especially in the East, the sun has already long attained its life-shedding power.

But it has seemed possible to doubt the fact of the bodily Resurrection on still other grounds. J. Weiss,[32] for instance, asserts that the two conceptions of the appearances of Jesus and of the Resurrection have nothing to do with one another. The appearances are, in his view, spiritual in nature, and proceed from Jesus after His return to His heavenly glory, while the Resurrection is to be understood only as a return of the body which had rested in the grave to the same natural life which it had possessed before death. The conception of the appearances, in his opinion, then represents the original thing; indeed, it has even been many times asserted that the Apostle Paul was not thinking of a coming to life again of a body that had been buried. But the supposed antithesis does not really exist. Resurrection and appearances are conceptions which mutually supplement one another. They do not contradict one another. It is true that the Greek word *egeiro* already contains the idea of a bodily awakening. The body that had been reposing raises itself up again. But the further assertion that the body must return under the same physical conditions as were accorded to it before death is incorrect. The conception of a glorified body reconciles the alleged contradictions. If one wished to agree with Weiss, one would have not only to attribute to the Gospels the contradictory presentation of bodily resurrection and spiritual appearances, but one would find that with Paul as well both trains of thought lay unreconciled beside one another.

[32] *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, for 1913, pp. 471 *sq.*

In the same 15th Chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians he speaks of appearances and at the same time uses the word *egeiro*, rise. But such contradictions would be absurd. The conceptions must both be original. Paul surely knows the empty grave from which the body came forth in glorified splendour. Even the word *egeiro* as has been said shows this, and the contrast in the same Corinthian passage of Resurrection with the statement "he was buried" gives further proof. This expression alone is also the sufficient refutation of the assertion sometimes defended, for instance by Loisy, but as baseless as though sucked from the writer's own fingers, that Jesus was not honourably buried at all, but, as an executed criminal, thrown into some chance hollow, so that the apostolic preaching of the Resurrection could not be in any way tested by the alleged empty grave.

It is a peculiar misconception of Pauline thought when some scholars assert over and over that the idea of a bodily resurrection was foreign to Paul, and point in proof to I Cor. 15:50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Obviously by that the Apostle means only that man in his earthly embodiment cannot enter into God's kingdom of eternity. And just for that reason the glorification through the Resurrection, or, as it is called in another place, "the change" (I Cor. 15:52) follows after the death. With this accords the comparison which he takes from his observations of nature and expresses in familiar, popular style, As the seed corn must first, as it were, die in the earth, in order to receive from God a new body in the upspringing plant, so it is with the Resurrection. Here, however, it is declared with all the clearness that could be desired that there must be some connection between the earthly body and the resurrection body which is not to be regarded as a garment of light that lies laid up in heaven as in a clothing warehouse. This last idea is only possible through a pedantic

interpretation of such an expression as II Cor. 5:1,[33] and then only by robbing the soul of the popular, naïve simile of the dying and revivified grain of corn. On the other hand, there is little sense in putting aside the comparison of the Resurrection of Jesus with the "quickening" of our bodies (Rom. 8:11) by talking about familiar modes of speech.[34] When we note how foreign to Paul was the Greek conception of the body in comparison with the soul, yes, how he regarded the body of a Christian with such awe that he called it the temple of the Holy Ghost (I Cor. 6:19), we shall more readily understand how he could express his participation in the heavenly glorification according to the analogy of the risen body of Jesus. Naturally, this doctrine was something unbearable to the heathen of that time. But if Paul nevertheless in his famous speech on Mars Hill in Athens (Acts 17:31) presented this doctrine of the Resurrection and so took it as part of the bargain that his Hellenistic hearers shook their heads over it, that only shows how deeply it is bound up with the fundamental conception of his mission preaching.

But people keep saying, Paul does not expressly speak in I Cor. 15 of the empty grave; therefore, he did not know of it, or at least he attributed to it no evidential value for belief in the Resurrection. In reply to this I have already shown that the passage in Corinthians contained, indirectly at least, the idea of the empty grave, and if the Apostle does not directly use this negative evidence for the Resurrection in that special connection, the reason is simply that the positive appeal to the appearances was calculated to make a greater impression on his hearers. Modern doubts lay naturally far from them. I repeat, however, that the passage in any case, only recalls that which the oral preaching had already

[33] See on this subject Bertram's *Das Wesen des Geistes nach der Anschauung des Apostles Paulus* in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, by M. Meinertz, Vol. 4, part 4, p. 121 *sq.* Münster i. W., 1913.

[34] Bousset, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 39, p. 7, 1914.

imparted to the Corinthians. When the Apostle was personally present he no doubt spoke of the events of the Resurrection morning, and in that connection also of the open grave.

That Paul rejected as well a coarsely realistic conception of the Resurrection is naturally true. But that is foreign also to the other biblical narratives. And even in those passages (Luke 24:30 and 41 *sq.*; John 20:27; 21:5) where the Risen seeks to make the reality of the Resurrection plain to the hesitating disciples by the material means of touch or of taking food, we must guard against a grossly realistic conception as though the Risen were subjected to natural *necessities*. In general the whole biblical narration is sober and natural, while the later apocryphal representations coarsen and fantastically elaborate. They often find suggestions in the New Testament document, but the border lines can always be easily distinguished where the legendary begins. How restrained, for instance, sounds the expression of the doubt of Thomas (John 20:24 *sq.*). The Lord comes to meet him, and makes formal demand of him to convince himself by touch of the reality of the Risen. But that the touching actually followed is not stated. Indeed, the context makes it clear that the Apostle is overcome by the words alone, and falls immediately at the Master's feet.

What a contrast between this affecting scene and an apocryphal narrative preserved in the Coptic language which belongs to the second century.[35] Here the Risen sends to the Apostles, first Martha (the sister of Lazarus who is not mentioned at all in the biblical account) to tell them the joyous news and to call them to Jesus. Since they will not believe, Mary is sent as second messenger. At last Jesus goes Himself. Then the sum-

[35] See the German translation in Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, p. 39. Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904. The Ethiopic translation supplies a gap in the Coptic text and makes it even coarser thereby. *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 9, part 3, p. 195 *sq.* Paris, 1913.

moning that they may convince themselves of the reality of the Risen is divided up. Peter is to put his fingers into the print of the nails in the hands, Thomas into the side, Andrew is to touch the feet. So the legend grows into insipidity so soon as it departs from the foundation of historic tradition.

This can perhaps be seen most clearly in what is said in the Gospel of Peter about the course of the Resurrection. This Gospel belongs to about the middle of the second century. I have already called attention to the way in which the canonical Gospels pass over the mysterious moment with delicate tact. The composer of the Gospel of Peter, on the contrary, takes occasion (35 *sq.*) to fill just this gap with his coarse fantasy, telling how two angels came down from heaven to bring out the Crucified, how their stature reached to the sky while the head of Him who was brought out rose above the clouds, how, further, the Cross came out behind them from the grave, and much else. Possibly nowhere can the difference between history and legend be so plainly felt as in this comparison between the Gospel of Peter and the canonical representations. Here the truth of the remark of Hans von Schubert[36] appears, "We must first let the whole spell which abides in the chastity of those narratives work on our minds in order to get a right feeling for the gulf that yawns between them and this new fifth story of the holy events of Easter morning." Thus the apocryphal legend serves indirectly to confirm the historical worth of the New Testament accounts.

The thought has been repeatedly expressed that the Resurrection of Jesus is the best evidenced historically of all events in antiquity that we know. Such a thought has much justification. We have in fact a whole series of old and reliable statements about it. In the battles

[36] *Die Composition des pseudo-petrinischen Evangelienfragmentes*, p. 94. Berlin, 1893.

against the radical doubters of the existence of Jesus, Heitmüller[37] once wrote: "It is monstrous to try to comprehend the history of primitive Christianity, the history of the sufferings and the persecutions, of the martyrdoms of a James, a Peter, a Paul as the history of people who let themselves be persecuted and killed for a phantom of their own creation." Heitmüller is quite right. But is it not also just to extend his remarks somewhat further and to say, We possess unexceptionable statements that on the third day after the death of Jesus the grave was empty, that trustworthy persons saw the Risen, yes, that they had no visions in some possible ecstasy, but that they, with no disposition to believe in a Resurrection, came soberly to the conviction of the fact of the Resurrection? It is further proved that faith in the Resurrection stood at the centre of apostolic preaching, that the missionaries from the first bore mockery, scorn and persecution on that account, that at last faith in the Risen overcame the world. Has any one, then, still the right to call this faith a phantom? D. Fr. Strauss said in this connection, profanely indeed, but with a logical deduction from his premises, that faith in the Resurrection taken historically,—that is, if one regarded its enormous effects in connection with its utter baselessness,—was "a world-historic humbug". I believe that after the preceding investigations which could naturally offer only a sketch of the problem, we are justified in having a quite different opinion of the "utter baselessness". Even scientifically we have the right to declare, The Resurrection of Jesus is an event that belongs to universal history, and a fact that overcomes the world.

[37] *Jesus*, p. 34. Tübingen, 1913.

The Catholic Church and War

By Mgr Batiffol, Litt.D.

In the first fortnight of December, 1914, a piece of news was circulated in Europe, which was immediately credited and then, soon after, confirmed. This news was that Pope Benedict XV had entered into negotiations with the principal belligerent States to suggest the idea of making a truce in the horrible war for Christmas Day. It was a touching thought, thoroughly worthy of him whom we call "the common father of the faithful", to have wished that the combatants should suspend hostilities on the birthday of the Saviour, the anniversary of the proclamation of "peace to men of good will". No soul could have been found still clinging to Christianity and humanity but would have been moved by this endeavour of the Pope who sought to prove that Christmas of 1914 should spare Europe the tears and the blood, and that, in the absence of gladness, there should be a twenty-four hours' cessation of the anguish weighing upon so many families.

The Pope's attempt came to nothing. Benedict XV was not discouraged by the result. Some days later he gave orders to all the Bishops of the belligerent States to secure for the prisoners of war concentrated within their respective dioceses the ministrations of priests speaking their language, so that these prisoners might not be deprived of the aid of religion if they were Catholics, and that, whatever their denominations, they should be visited by some friend able to offer them friendly services. Cardinal Gasparri, transmitting this command of the Pope to the Bishops, said to them: "I

think it superfluous to add that His Holiness makes no distinction of religion, of nationality, or of language, so that the beneficent action of the priests sent to the prisoners of war may embrace all the unfortunate men with the same broad sweep as the charity of Jesus Christ."

The inspiration of these acts recalls the traditional charity of the Church setting itself to console mankind amid the frightful ills of war: the "God's Truces" (*trêves de Dieu*) were a creation of that charity. These acts also recall the part of peacemaker and mediator which the Popes of mediaeval Christianity so often and so efficaciously performed. And this inspiration, as well as this *rôle*, manifests the profound feeling of the Church as to war in itself, a thought which I would endeavour to delineate while faithfully abstracting from the actual conditions.

The sentiments of the Church find very authentic expression in her Liturgy, which is at once the language which the Church speaks to her faithful and that which the faithful learn to speak. The Roman Liturgy, like everything that is Roman, faces a universal horizon: it conceives the Church as adequate to the *orbis terrarum*, and consequently shrinks from every nationalist expression which would lower the "body of Christ" to the measure of a national Church. The Canon of the Mass provides for the mention of the King, but that mention is, so to say, neutralized by the mentions which precede and follow it:

. . . tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta catholica, quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum, una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N., et antistite nostro N., et rege (vel imperatore) nostro N., et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus.

The *Catholica*, as St. Augustine loved to say, asks of God peace for itself and at the same time for the whole extent of the earth, *pacificare toto orbe terrarum*. She it

is again who in the Canon of the Roman Mass asks of God peace for the present time, a peace which is not that of the funerary inscriptions, *in pace dei*, but the peace of the peoples: "*Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas.*" These words were introduced into the Roman Canon by Pope St. Gregory the Great; it has been conjectured that this prayer for temporal peace was suggested by the incessant evils at the time of the Lombard invasion, and this is very probable; the prayer has survived the Lombards of the early seventh century, it is so "eternally opportune" that the Church addresses it to God in every Mass which she celebrates.

The Church prays for the peace of the world; she prays to God to spare her children war in the same invocation of the litany in which she asks Him to preserve them from pestilence and famine, because she regards war as above all things a scourge. The Church is *en thèse* a non-combatant. Open the Roman Missal; among the Masses which the Church reserves for divers occasions in the life of the Christian people, you shall find no Mass to ask victory of God or even to thank Him for it. The Liturgy, which has assimilated so many Jewish elements borrowed from the language of the Old Testament, has left out all its warlike elements. The Church refrains from saying that the God of the Gospel fights for this or that people in Christendom against this or that other. Whencesoever may come the celebrated formula *Gesta dei per Francos*, I am very sure that it has nothing either liturgical or Roman.

Open the Roman Missal and you shall find there a Mass *Contra paganos*, which is a Mass to ask help of God against the infidels—that is, the barbarians, the Saracens, the Turks. You shall find a Mass *Pro pace*, which is a Mass of non-combatants asking God to protect their territory against invasion and its horrors. You shall find there, lastly, a Mass *Pro tempore belli*. The prayer of the faithful rises to God to ask Him to

abate the ferocity of enemies, to put away the cruelty of war, to inspire the people to accept the scourge of war as a chastisement. I cite the first prayer of this Mass *Pro tempore belli:*

Deus qui conteris bella et impugnatores in te sperantium potentia tuae defensionis expugnas: auxiliare familiis tuis implorantibus misericordiam tuam, ut, inimicorum suorum feritate depressa, incessabili te gratiarum actione laudemus.

God, the Master of our destinies, is able to break war and to defend whoever hopes in Him. The Church asks of Him to aid His servants who implore His mercy and to reduce the ferocity of the enemy to impotence. This prayer is entirely a prayer of non-combatants.

We should be mistaken, however, in saying that the Church has never prayed for combatants; to do so would be to forget that chivalry is purely a creation of mediaeval Christianity, and that from the time of chivalry there remain to us in the Roman Pontifical prayers for blessing arms and standards, and in like manner *Pro benedictione novi militis.* There another sentiment of the Church expresses itself.

The *Benedictio novi militis* is a comparatively recent Liturgy: assigned to the thirteenth century, it cannot be much earlier. The first act of the *Benedictio* consists in blessing the soldier's sword. The Bishop asks of God to bless it, that the soldier may be a "*defensor Ecclesiarum, viduarum, orphanorum, omniumque deo servientium*"; but the Bishop supposes that the soldier will use it only against pagans and against heretics, or against those who lay snares for him (*aliisque insidientibus sit terror et formido*). The Bishop considers war only under this threefold aspect: protecting the weak, fighting against pagans and heretics, and against aggressors who "lay snares".

The second prayer which the Bishop pronounces has a more warlike colour: the Bishop desires that the soldier whom he is about to arm may crush his visible enemies

and obtain victory (*visibiles inimicos conculcet victoriaque per omnia potitus semper maneat illaesus*). This prayer desires victory without any condition and speaks of "visible enemies" without specifying what enemies are meant. It recalls to God that He has permitted men on earth to use the sword, *ad evitandam malitiam reproborum et tuendam iustitiam.* It mentions how, in the Gospel, God causes it to be said by St. John the Baptist to soldiers who visit him in the desert that they must molest no one and must be content with their pay (*ut neminem concuterent, sed propriis contenti essent stipendiis*). It asks God to give the new soldier the strength and courage which he needs to defend the Faith and justice (*ad fidei et iustitiae defensionem*), and the grace to wrong no one with this sword (*neminem cum gladio isto iniuste laedat*), but on the contrary to defend all that is right and just (*omnia cum eo iusta et recta defendat*).

The sword being blessed, the Bishop holds it out to the soldier, saying to him:

Accipe gladium istum, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, et utaris eo ad defensionem tuam ac sanctae dei Ecclesiae, et ad confusionem inimicorum crucis Christi ac fidei Christianae; et quantum humana fragilitas permiserit, eum eo neminem iniuste laedas. . . .

The Bishop strikes three times with the flat of the sword the soldier who kneels before him, accompanying this gesture of investiture with these beautiful words:

Esto miles pacificus, strenuus, fidelis, et deo devotus.

This ceremony, which fell into desuetude centuries ago, might legitimately be revived by any Bishop who wished to revive it. The reasons why it fell into desuetude can easily be seen: the sword with which the modern soldier is armed does not serve him for the defence of Holy Church and the discomfiture of the enemies of the Cross: the modern sword is not a crusader's sword, and this benediction is above all a crusader's benediction. Nevertheless, abstracting from the crusade per-

spective, there remains the affirmation that the employment of the sword is permitted by God to coerce the wicked and protect justice: the prohibition to hurt anyone unjustly, the obligation to protect justice. This liturgical affirmation implies a conception which goes beyond that of the crusade, or holy war, and which is nothing else but the conception of just war, war in defence of oppressed right, war made only to promote peace, and such was the sense of that beautiful Augustinian expression: *Esto miles pacificus.*

This liturgical teaching needs the commentary of theological teaching.

The history of dogmas is a branch of learning which for half a century has been the subject of monographs and syntheses, the number of which is still increasing: the history of Christian ethics, which remains to be undertaken, would present as extended a field of studies, and how instructive! A history of Christian ethics would be the history of the moral conscience of Christianity, of its imperative demands and its scruples.

Several of us not long ago set to work to sketch out a history of Christian morals on the subject of war, and from that history it seems to stand out clearly that the Church throughout the ages has organized a morality of war; all the first lineaments appear in St. Ambrose, and the principal theses are as early as St. Augustine: in the thirteenth century St. Thomas Aquinas brings these Augustinian theses into the system of his scholastic ethics: in the sixteenth century the commentators of St. Thomas, the Dominican Francis de Vitoria, and the Jesuit Suarez, among the first, develop and finish the morality of war.[1] When Grotius was to create the law of nations he was only to laicize the doctrine of the theologians. It may be said without paradox that

[1] *L'Eglise et la guerre,* by MM. Monceaux, Chinon, Vanderpol, Rolland, Duval, Tanquerey and Batiffol (Paris, 1913).

modern international law, so far from being a product of the French Revolution or of the Reformation, is only one chapter of the old theological morality.

The Christian ethics of war are dominated by a principle which springs out of the Gospel, namely, that war is a sin. All the qualities of courage, renunciation, endurance, which war can develop in a people, will only result in war's not being, essentially, in the view of the Christian conscience, a recourse to violence, an effusion of blood, a crime. Christianity did not wait for Tolstoi to develop this principle out of the Gospel. In this sense nothing is more historical, more traditional, more sincere, than the old dictum: The Church shudders at blood (*Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*). Nevertheless in ethics, the complexity of life is discovered, and a principle is not always enough to regulate it.

For it is also true that war too often is imposed as a necessity, and even the history of the people of God bears witness that war has often been imposed upon it by God's order. There are, then, unavoidable wars, and there are wars willed by God. The theologians, following St. Augustine, infer from this that war, which is essentially a sin, may accidentally cease to be a sin. They have not sought to determine whether wars have been willed by God since the origin of the Church: the famous "God wills it" of the Crusaders is a popular cry which St. Thomas Aquinas did not transpose into a scholastic thesis. We must not speak, then, of wars willed by God. The theologian asks himself only if war is legitimate, and he lays down as a thesis that there is none legitimate except the war which has a just cause.

The case of a prince or State which repels an unjust aggressor does not raise any controversy (*vim repellere omnia iura permittunt*). At the other pole is the case of the prince or State which declares war in order to obtain reparation of a grave injustice committed to its detriment, and which the adversary refuses to repair

by pacific methods: war is then in the eyes of theologians a fashion of procedure by which the offended party seeks his rights. The theologians, like Vitoria, following St. Thomas, even liken the offended party to a judge, and the enemy to a malefactor, and they derive the right to make war from the *ius gladii* which St. Paul recognizes in the Roman magistrate. Whatever may be said of this comparison, which we will discuss later on, Vitoria says forcibly and categorically that the violation of rights is the only just cause which can be alleged for the making of war (*Unice est et sola causa iusta inferendi bellum iniuria accepta*).

Moreover, the glory of the prince is not a motive sufficient to justify a war. No more is the wish to take revenge and to clear oneself on the point of honour. No more is the ambition to dominate. St. Augustine has said these things in definite terms which are accepted throughout the whole theological tradition:

"Nocendi cupiditas, ulciscendi crudelitas impacatus, implaccabilis animus, feritas rebellandi, libido dominandi, et si qua sunt sinistra, haec sunt quae in bellis iure culpantur."

After such decided statements, we cannot but be astonished at one thing, and that is that Christian society has been able to celebrate the military glory of most of the princes of past times.

We must go on to the consequences of the principle of the *iusta causa*, which forbids in most cases the war of conquest. A conquest may be the just reparation claimed for an injustice committed by the adversary: but a war willed for the sake of conquest is certainly an unjust war, and may be classed with rapine, that is to say, brigandage. St. Augustine had the boldness to avow that most of the wars of Roman history were on this head unlawful, whether in their principle or in their results. And St. Thomas did not hesitate to write that war for gain is a sin (*propter prædam militare peccatum est*). Besides, conquest must not be understood only as

to territory: justice forbids war to be made to oblige a weak people to give up some element of their sovereignty, or oblige them to consent to something detrimental to their economic interests. Of such ways of growing St. Augustine was thinking when he saw in the conquests of Rome a colossal brigandage (*quid aliud quam grande latrocinium*).

We owe justice, says Suarez, to infidel princes, the Mussulmans, for instance, as well as Christian princes: it is vain to say that the infidels are not the masters of what they possess, or to invoke the incapacity of infidels to govern properly.

The prince who declares war for a just cause must be certain of the justice of his cause: a simple probability is not enough. St. Alphonsus Liguori teaches that war ordinarily brings such evils with it that practically it can almost never be regarded as just, if it is made for only *probable* reasons, and not *certain*. This opinion, which is that of moralists whom we call probabilists, is considered in the common teaching as the only defensible one. Theologians bring another restriction to the legitimacy of war, even just war: it is necessary, they say, that all the possibilities of a pacific settlement of the question should have been exhausted before having recourse to force. Suarez wishes that satisfaction should be demanded of the party in the wrong, for if he is ready to give satisfaction, it would be an injustice to make war upon him. To conduct diplomatic conversations in a brusque manner, to render them impossible by an ultimatum which would be a challenge, are so many attitudes which the theologian would consider as offences against justice. They profess even that the declaration of war should precede the opening of hostilities, without which the war would be unjust.

They bring the same scruples as to justice, in their estimation of what is permitted in time of war. In the first place they distinguish combatants and non-com-

batants, that is to say, the army in action and the fortified places on one side, and the peaceable inhabitants, unarmed, who do not take part in the operations or in the defence, on the other. Suarez points out that even in war against Saracens one has no right to kill either women or children. If one carry off from the "innocent" those things of which the enemy would make use to prolong the unjust war—arms, victuals, horses, ships—one must not pillage the farmers and risk starving non-combatants. Suarez concedes that one may carry off women and children into captivity, to be liberated afterwards for a ransom, but the "innocent" who are made captives must never be put to death. The general conscience has progressed since the sixteenth century upon this point: this merchandise of the "innocent" and the idea of ransom is no longer accepted. In like manner, on the question of booty, Suarez did not forbid the sack of cities, though he recognizes that it is a frightful thing; for us, private property remains, like the non-combatants themselves, exempt, according to the rules of war. Public property may be subjected to contribution: Suarez, however, does not grant the right of capture to anyone but the prince who is defending a just cause, and who, by means of this booty, defrays his expenses and indemnifies his losses at the same time that he imposes a mulct on the prince or people who are in fault. There must also be a proportion between the crime and the chastisement; if it happened, says Suarez, that the French had devastated a Spanish town, the Spaniards would not be justified by that in pillaging the whole kingdom of France.

The question of prohibited arms is not treated by the theologians, though the canons of councils (for instance, the Lateran Council of 1139) have prohibited certain arms "in wars against Christians and Catholics", notably the use of ballists and of arbalests (*ballistariorum et sagittariorum*). But theologians raise the question of *ruses*

de guerre. St. Thomas accepts stratagems (*insidiae*) which are a form of tactics and of strategy. But he forbids us to deceive the enemy by a lying affirmation or by "not keeping a promise which has been made to him": "*et istud semper est illicitum*", says St. Thomas decidedly, "*et hoc modo nullus debet hostes fallere.*" Christian honour speaks there by the mouth of the Angelic Doctor. A citation from St. Ambrose comes in addition to indicate that this honour is a heritage from ancient civilization. "There are", says the patrician Bishop, "some laws and conventions of war which are observed even among enemies" ([*sunt*] *quaedam iura bellorum et foedera etiam inter ipsos hostes servanda*).

War, being a procedure with the object of settling a question of right, has no other end than peace with justice. With this condition, the evangelical precept which obliges us to peace as to a virtue, and the legality of just war, are consonant. For he who undertakes a just war is seeking peace, and thus, St. Thomas assures us, is not falling short of peace, other than the evil peace which the Saviour condemned: "I am not come to bring you peace but the sword" (Matt. 10:34). St. Thomas, very appropriately, cites this fine maxim of St. Augustine: "*Non quaeritur pax ut bellum exerceatur, sed bellum geritur ut pax acquiratur: esto ergo bellando pacificus.*"

The conquering prince, Francis de Vitoria thinks, must use his victory with a Christian moderation, he is here compared with a minister of justice: he is to re-establish justice, to chastise those in fault, but he will spare the country. He may depose the conquered prince, and set up another in his place, or assign the kingdom to himself; but that is not always permitted, for a violation of right can be a just cause of war, without being a just reason for the deposition of the conquered prince, at least when that prince is not guilty of cruelties and crimes, or when there is another means of assuring a durable peace.

The doctrine of the Liturgy and the doctrine of the theologians are in harmony without, however, giving the same sounds. The Liturgy, which is a prayer, asks God for the peace of the world and expects God to break war: this language is the oldest, that of the Golden Age of Western Liturgy.[2] This very Liturgy, however, but in texts of the period of chivalry, blesses the soldiers whom it considers as the champions of the faith and of justice; at the same time, it forbids them to commit any injustice, and to hurt any innocent person. This language is that of a wiser age in which the theory of just war has been developed, thanks to the theologians. The theory itself is a mere theory of natural law: it is produced by the extension of the idea of justice to the relations between peoples, it is the first attempt at the organization of a *ius gentium*, and the first prelude to the juridical work of The Hague. The doctrine of the theologians, the expression more and more determinate of the Church's conscience, and of her scruples on the subject of war, is a doctrine at once very strong and very fragile. The only lawful war is the just war, since only the just war can be likened to a juridical process, or, in other words, war is a process to assert a right, whence it follows that, in the first place, it must be in the service of a right, and then, that it must be restrained by rules of right. And so the right precedes the war, far from the war making the right, and war is only permissible when it vindicates and defends a right. This very noble and very downright conception is the honour of the Christian conscience.

The fragility of this doctrine consists in this, that most often, war proceeding from the insistence on a right, and each of the parties being supported by his *bona fides* —which, moreover, is a very optimistic supposition,— each of the two parties believes himself to be in the

[2]Compare, Atwell Bayley, *A Century of Collects, Selected and Translated*, pp. 32–34 (London).

right, and so to have a just cause for war. No one is an impartial judge in his own cause. Unfortunately the prince, or the State, who sacrifices most to the *libido dominandi*, always has sufficient reasons for deceiving himself about the cause which he defends and for believing it, or calling it, just and holy.

Another reason for the fragility of this doctrine is that war considered as a procedure is a vitiated procedure. For every procedure supposes a tribunal to regulate it: in war there is no other judicature than the "fortune of arms", an adventurous justice in which no one would dare to recognize the judgment of God, any more than the verdict of the right.

Then the cause of modern war is never simple, the cause invoked is often only an occasion seized upon, sometimes a diplomatic pretext: war breaks out because it has been prepared silently for years, it breaks out as the consequence of a prolonged situation, aggravated, and which is the fatal heritage of departed generations. The causes of war accumulate for a long time: when the war breaks out, it has not a cause but twenty far-off causes, and only one proximate cause. Fortunate, indeed, if this proximate cause is discernible.

Thus the lawfulness of the just war is an assured principle of natural law, and at the same time, a principle, the application of which is always difficult: the Church has very well perceived the deficiency of this doctrine, which is too arbitrary, and that is why she has for centuries professed that mediation is preferable to war.

As every war supposes a litigant, the Church has sought to impose a judge of disputes between princes. Innocent III, reconciling Philip of Suabia and Olhan of Brunswick, declared: "The Pope is the sovereign mediator of the earth." This declaration of the Pope, which opens the thirteenth century, formulates a policy of mediation which has been exercised since the reform of Christianity in the eleventh century, and which was

to continue until the sixteenth century, that is to say, until the collapse of mediaeval Christianity: the names of Popes Leo IX, Pascal II, Gregory VII, Urban II, Alexander III, Innocent III, Honorius III, Gregory IX, Boniface VIII, Clement V, John XXII, and Martin V—and we do not cite all those who could be cited—are attached to acts of arbitration between princes: in 1235 Genoa and Venice, by their treaty of alliance, engaged themselves to submit their future litigation to the "arbitration of the Holy See".[3]

By a curious anomaly the theologians of the Middle Ages, St. Thomas first among them, have not made any room for the principle of papal mediation in their ethics of war. Suarez, on the contrary, adheres to it at the very time when papal mediation disappeared from political history. Suarez taught that in certain cases it belongs to the Pope to pronounce the law and cut short the dispute, if the princes at variance are Catholics: notice that for Suarez the Pope exercises a function of his own proper sovereignty in intervening, for he has the right to call the litigants before him and deliver a sentence which is obligatory on the parties in virtue of the indirect power which he has over Christian princes. The theory of Suarez was not at all made to impose itself upon the international law of a Europe which was becoming Gallican preparatory to laicizing itself. But we can understand how in our day the Church and the Holy See have been able to be better prepared than any other power in the world to connect themselves with the doctrine of arbitration.

In answering on the 10th February, 1899, Count Mouraviff's circular on the subject of the projected Hague Conference, Cardinal Rampolla expressed the thought of the Holy See in these terms:

[3]See L. Rolland, "The intervention of the heads of the Church for the maintenance of peace and the suppression of war", in *L'Eglise et la guerre*, vii, 4.

"Face to face with a state of things so sad as the actual state, the institution of mediation and arbitration appears like the most opportune remedy: it responds to all the expectations and aspirations of the Holy See. . . . The Holy See has the most ardent hope that the principle of mediation and arbitration may find a favourable reception in the counsels of the Powers, and may be applied as widely as possible. . . . It is convinced that if an international understanding should be effected on this point, the results would be most happy for civilization."[4]

There is another perspective opened by the theological ethics of the war. St. Thomas teaches in effect that for a war to be just it must be made by order of the prince, that is to say, by order of the authority which is sovereign in the State. This principle has as its immediate consequence to forbid as unjust all private wars. The reason which St. Thomas gives for this is that a private person can always assert his right before the tribunal of a superior (*Potest ius suum in iudicio superioris prosequi*). The sovereign prince, on the contrary, has no superior (St. Thomas does not mention the papal power), to whom he can have recourse against another prince or to whom recourse can be had against him. And it is precisely this lack of a *iudicium superioris* which makes the recourse to war legitimate.

Should we be flattering ourselves with a naïve illusion if we considered the Tribunal of The Hague as constituting from henceforth that *iudicium superioris* which can always be invoked? The great Dominican, Domingo de Soto, assured us that between Christian princes there could hardly be any just war, because they can determine their differences without recourse to war. The sentiment of this theologian of the sixteenth century is truer today than ever, because in supposing that papal mediation would be refused by the non-Catholic princes, The Hague Tribunal is left accessible to all. It is good to recall that the arbitration of Leo XIII was solicited by Bismarck in the conflict between Germany and Spain on the subject of the Carolines. And then the

[4]Cited by A. Tanquerey, in *L'Eglise et la guerre*, viii, 2.

existence of the International Tribunal at The Hague, that is to say, of a *iudicium superioris* always henceforward compares every war to that which in other days was a private war, and makes him who declares war an unjust aggressor.

We do not overlook that comparing war to a judicial procedure is a view to which jurists are at present very much attached. They tell us: In the common law of the actual period, laws are not active until after the preliminary decision of the judge, and so every procedure tending by definition to the recognition of a law supposes a judge and a judgment in principle; no one does justice to himself. But there is another principle to consider, that of direct action, which consists precisely in administering justice oneself, or, to speak more exactly, in "realizing for oneself all one's interest by the appropriate acts of execution, and that with justice".[5] Direct action is found, for instance, in the constitutional matters, in which public authorities and political parties, in their struggles, do justice to themselves, and in which the law of the majority rules, that is to say, the law of the stronger, and also in the national relations, where it is the foundation of the right of war, and more ordinarily, in administrative law, in which public ministries carry out their rights to the end in an extra-judiciary manner. Thus war is a procedure, but a procedure of direct action.

This distinction, far from putting us to rout, confirms us in our thought. We consider that the comparison of war to a judiciary procedure was not well founded, and the answer is made to us that war is an extra-judiciary procedure: we agree to this. We complain that by war the right was decided by the stronger: it is agreed that direct action is "a privilege which brings us back to the archaic epochs", and that it is actually found only in the domains where law is imperfect, and

[5]Maurice Haurion, *Précis de droit administratif*, p. 23 (1911).

legislation is badly established, and where there is no authority, either jurisdictional or otherwise, strongly enough established to impose its arbitration. If there is question of international conflict, the permanent Court of The Hague really is only an organ of voluntary arbitration. Let it be confessed that international law is imperfect, and let us hope that that law may progress as it should do, but let us also add that for us theologians the question is moral, still more than juridical: we look at war as a case of conscience, and the case of conscience would not be resolved from the moment that we should be making of war a direct action; the case of conscience would subsist whole and entire. "The foundation of the right", Mommsen has written somewhere, "is the possibility of oneself doing justice": this is the whole morality of direct action, and it is all that we wish to say of the immorality of war in itself.[6]

The preceding outline is an outline of theological principles of which the writer does not desire to make any application to the war which is deluging Europe with blood. But let no one suspect him of indifference: he has read the reply, signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury, of York and of Armagh, and by his friend the Dean of Wells, also by many eminent members of the Church of England, Dr. Sanday, Dr. Scott Holland, etc., and by Nonconformists like Lord Balfour, Dr. Ramsay, etc., to the appeal sent by German theologians "To the Evangelical Churches Abroad": I would sign with both my hands that reply, the considerations of which appear chosen and formulated with an absolute justice and a perfect dignity. Here, however, we are not combatants, but constructors. Our vision sees beyond the present horizon in order to foretell and prepare for the future of human civilization, so horribly overthrown at this hour, and in that near future it seems to us that the Catholic Church has a message to proclaim.

[6] *Haurion*, p. 23.

The ancient Church, by virtue of the Gospel which it preserves and by the age-long labour of its conscience, is providentially prepared to speak to this civilization the words of peace and of justice of which it has so great a need. The ancient Church prays for universal peace, and it works for the defence of Christian public right. It is not enough to remedy present evils with ambulances; we must look very far ahead of us towards a peace which shall be durable because it will be organized in common by all the united peoples of civilization of the world, and because it will be organized, not as an ethnic and economic equilibrium, but as a thing of justice and a law: an organization nearer than it seems, I have the firm hope, an organization, in which the old Church shall recognize the realization of what was, so many centuries ago, its spirit and its thought.

It is our consolation to have seen these sentiments confirmed by the Encyclical Letter of Benedict XV of the 1st November, 1914, the first Encyclical of the new Pontificate. The Pope there implores the chiefs of States and the Governments to consider "how much has already been shed of tears and of blood and to give back to their peoples without delay the precious gift of peace." How pertinent is this complaint of the Pope in rendering the verses of a liturgical hymn of Pascal time:

Sat funeri, sat lacrimis,
Sat est datum doloribus.
Surrexit extinctor necis,
Clamat coruscans angelus.

This appeal is not, however, that of a sentimental, romantic pacificist. It is an appeal for peace through right. The Pope says boldly: "If there have been rights violated, there certainly are other procedures, there are other means [than war] to repair them: these means, after having laid down arms, let them be tried in all good faith, and with a sincere will. It is our love for all

nations which urges us to hold this language." There is no language more worthy of the Catholic Church in its sublime neutrality than that of the guardian of the divine law.

PARIS.

The Church and War

By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B.,
Secretary of the Friends' Foreign Mission Association, London.

The outbreak of war between the great nations in Europe which stand before the world for Christian civilization has brought home to thinking men everywhere the urgent necessity of finding some method of dealing with international differences which shall, if possible, prevent the repetition of bloodshed upon so gigantic a scale. The problem is one which is surrounded with difficulties, many of which must be faced by rulers and statesmen. We have all, however, come to the conclusion that we cannot leave the solution of these questions only in their hands. In some way the moral consciousness of the nations must be awakened, and the voice of reason and goodwill must be supported by the strength of a great spiritual conviction. The pathetic words of the dying Pope, who is reported to have said: "Once the Church could have stopped this", come as a challenge to all Christian men and women to reconsider the whole question of the relation of the Church to national and international life, and to discover some means by which the spirit of Christ can more deeply influence the councils of the nations.

To those outside the Church, and especially the thoughtful representatives of the non-Christian systems of religion, the present position of the Church seems utterly paradoxical. On the one hand is her generally recognized claim to have a universal message of love, a gospel which is equally suited to all sections of the

human race. On the other hand is the plain fact that, in each of the warring nations, the Church of Christ is identifying herself with the national cause, and that prayers are continually being offered to the same God from opposing camps. This not only raises the old problem about prayer where two equally good and sincere men pray for diametrically opposite objects. The Church is further seen to be asking God to assist her in the ghastly work of self-destruction. "Members of the body of Christ are tearing one another, and His body is bleeding as it once bled on Calvary, but this time the wounds are dealt by His friends. It is as though Peter were driving home the nails, and John were piercing the side."[1]

The perplexity of Indian Christians is voiced by one who writes thus in *The Challenge* (4th December, 1914):

"There is some anxiety, I gather, about the financing of missions during the present crisis. But the difficulty of finance, I think, is a very small problem compared with the enormous burden of proof that, in the eyes of the enlightened spiritual Hindu, this war would throw upon European missionaries who come to us hereafter to preach the Gospel of Love.

"I remember a service in St. Paul's Cathedral which I attended some time about the commencement of the war. It was a reverent congregation. There was obviously on their faces the pressure of a great crisis which they felt both as a nation and as individuals. The stately, superb service of the Church of England was more impressive than ever, and under the dome of the Cathedral I seemed to hear the voice of a great nation loudly pleading with God. But when the sermon came the whole effect of the service was lost on me. It justified and vindicated and challenged, and ended by quoting from a poem published in the Press some time ago, which spoke of the 'joyful' sound of the 'rolling drum' and other war delights of old pagan time. It was a crushing disappointment. As I walked home that night, amid the glaring lights and the many khaki uniforms, threading my way through that great throng that seemed continually to pour out of the Cathedral, my thoughts went back for a moment across the seas, to my village home in India, far from the military camps and the Legislative Council—pagan, heathen, animistic, call it what you like—but where they love their neighbours, and, if they hate, they hate with a bad conscience; and I felt that there at least, in the wide world today, Christ could still walk as He walked in Galilee."

[1]Rev. W. Temple in *Christianity and War: Papers for War Time. No. 1.*

There are, in fact, two indictments which may be urged against the Church today. The first is that she has not, after all these centuries, set before the world in concrete terms a better way of life which would dispense with this terrible way of settling international disputes. The second is that she has not made her demand upon her own members so clear and compelling that, whatever the consequences, they could not destroy one another. Nationality has proved a stronger call even on Christians than their common Christianity. George Bernard Shaw may state the difficulty in an extreme way, but at least he succeeds in making us face the hideous denial of our faith which is involved in this war. "The straightforward course", he says, "and the one that would serve the Church best in the long run, would be to close our professedly Christian Churches the moment war is declared by us, and reopen them only on the signing of peace. . . . [This] would act as a most powerful reminder that, though the glory of war is a famous and ancient glory, it is not the final glory of God."[2]

Now, if we are to get behind this dilemma, it is time we did a great deal of hard thinking. The fact is that we have all been content to accept the current standards of Christianity. What is really wrong with us is an utterly inadequate conception of that for which the Church stands. In the light of the catastrophe that has fallen upon us, we are summoned to get back to first principles, and to discover once more the early sources of inspiration. In making this effort, we are at once reminded of the fact that the early Church, during the first two centuries, took for granted that her members could have no part in the military system. The well known formula, "I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight", was the plain intuitive logic of the childlike mind. Did this not more nearly interpret the mind of Christ

[2]Supplement to *New Statesman*, 14th Nov., 1914, p. 25.

than the later hair-splitting of "the wise and prudent"? It is certainly true that some of the most spiritual movements within and without the orthodox Church were characterized by a return to this simple logic. The Cathari, who, during the eleventh century, spread over a large part of Europe, St. Francis and his earlier disciples, Wycliffe and many of the Lollards, the Moravian Church, a number of smaller sects at the time of the Reformation, and especially the Quakers—all these and a good many more have testified to the fact that "men of warre are not allowed by the Gospel, the Gospel knoweth peace and not warre."[3]

As Dr. Selbie recently reminded us, the experts in religion are not only the theologians but also the saints. The opinion of both has to be weighed in reaching a just conclusion as to Christian conduct. Whatever the evidence of the former may be, it is at least clear that many of the saints have found themselves unable to take up arms for whatever cause. The "people called Quakers" thus expressed themselves in an address to King Charles II in 1660:

> "We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatever; this is our testimony to the whole world. The Spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil, and again to move into it; and we certainly know and testify to the world, that the Spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of this world."

These words voice the conviction not only of the comparatively small body of persons who uttered them, but of a large number in the family of God who, through the Christian centuries, have felt compelled, whatever the State might demand, to follow what they conceived to be their Master's command. Are these the spiritual

[3]Quoted from a Lollard declaration given in *Christ and War*, by W. E. Wilson, whose summary of the historical question should be consulted for fuller information, see pp. 75–102.

pioneers who are pointing the way to the truly Christian life, or are they a negligible body of extremists who have mistaken, in all sincerity, the meaning of Christ's teaching, and whose protest against war is, in reality, a danger to society? The position taken by the writer of this paper is that the deep instinct which has led many individuals, and some religious bodies, including the Church of the first two centuries, to oppose *all* war, is founded in the very heart of the Christian ethic. It takes us right back to some of the most fundamental Christian conceptions. A consideration of its full meaning helps us to realize, perhaps more than anything else, what is the true nature of the Church's apostasy from Christ, why we are at war with ourselves in the Church, and why we are unable to reach the masses of thoughtful men and women in all walks of life who stand aloof from Christianity. To make good this claim is beyond the possible reach of this article. All that can be done is to indicate the lines along which a solution may, perhaps, be found.

While, no doubt, it is true that tendencies were at work within the Church before the conversion of Constantine[4] which were preparing her for the change that then took place, it is, nevertheless, clear that the association of Church and State did materially alter Christian thought in facing many fundamental questions. A whole world of new problems arose, and these were faced not only in the light of the teaching of Christ and the experience of the early Church, but also in the light of the new necessity for justifying the State, and for showing the nature of the relation of the Church thereto. From some points of view there was undoubted gain. It became possible in a new way for the Christian statesman to apply his principles to the national life. The

[4]As witness the less certain testimony in regard to war during the third century, though Origen and Tertullian both maintained that the Christian could not fight. It is the latter who said "The Lord in disarming Peter unbelted every soldier" (*De Idolol.*, 19).

Christian ethic was found to have a wider social application, it became possible to turn a purifying stream into the stagnant and putrefying waters of political life. Looking back, it appears as though the process had been inevitable. The Church could not continue to grow without facing her relationship to the State. It is small wonder that great modifications in both resulted.

Yet the process was by no means an unmixed good for the Church. Her fresh strong life became mixed into the life of the world. The moral choices for the individual became desperately complicated. It seems almost impossible today to recover the atmosphere in which the direct application of the teaching of Christ can be made to the life of the individual without thought of the contamination of evil in which he, as a member of the Church and of the State, is so inextricably involved. It is, however, in that atmosphere that the early disciples who were nearest to our Lord worked out the implications of their faith, and those who have most nearly regained it seem frequently to have led the moral conscience of mankind.

The problem of the relation of Church to State became vastly more difficult when the Church herself gained temporal power, and in the days when Christianity was threatened by the Moslem advance. Then, surely, it seemed necessary for all the followers of Christ to stand together and to resist by force of arms—the only force, it seemed, that would appeal to the Saracen hordes. Was not the Church of Christ and all that it stood for in danger of being swept into the sea? Was not the supremacy and even the very existence of the true faith threatened by the infidel? Two facts stand out clearly as we look back on these pages in the Church's history; her spiritual power declined while her temporal power increased, and her past history, from the time of Constantine, had started her on a path which led inevitably to the use of material forces in resisting the advance of

Islam.[5] We have no means of knowing what the issue would have been if this great anti-Christian wave had been met by the one force which the Church has any right to use. We do know that, in using the force of arms, she suffered within herself a great defeat. Can we not trace to this same cause the prevalence of the idea that heresy could be stamped out by the methods used in the Inquisition, an idea which is involved in the belief that the Kingdom of God is to be extended by war?

All through these centuries there had at least been the attempt to preserve the catholic idea of the Church. Had the Church maintained this idea and purified herself from that association with the State which had resulted in her becoming a political force, it may be that she would today be in a position in which she could have prevented this world war. Instead of this, as we know, came the Protestant Reformation, with the consequent division of the Church of the West into numberless sections. While many of these were dissociated from the State, and, in several cases, disowned the use of temporal power as a means of attaining spiritual ends, there crept into the Church a new danger. As the catholic idea was largely lost, many of the new denominations were limited in their membership to the citizens of a single state, and several became State Churches. The inevitable result was that the State ideals became a part of the life of the Church; the wider international point of view became increasingly swallowed up into the purely national one, and the binding sense of an international fellowship in Christ died away or became subordinate to the prior claim of the nation. The fellowship of any Church which is confined to persons of one nation is something less than the true Church fellowship, and at once opens

[5]In fact it may be said with truth that, had the Church maintained her purity without compromise with "the world", Mohammedanism would never have threatened her life, and might even never have come into existence.

the way for the identification of the interests of one nation with those of the Kingdom of God which is being made on so large a scale today.

We have all been guilty of this to some degree. It is very difficult for those of us to think otherwise who see our nation engaged in a war which appears to be waged in the higher interests of humanity. But the Church should be in the position of standing over against the individual conscience, calling it back in insistent tones to a recollection of the fact that this glory "is not the final glory of God."

We come back again, then, to our fundamental problem. What lies behind the intuition that has prevented so many followers of Christ from fighting? Can we regain a conception of the Church and of the Kingdom of God that will justify this protest? Does the justification of it lead us out into such a vision of the Kingdom as may once again enable the Church to turn the world upside down? In trying to work into the heart of so vast a problem we are checked at every turn by the difficulty of finding words for the thoughts that seek expression. Let us at least essay the task and confess, before we begin, that we shall not be entirely successful. For we are engaged on the supreme effort of the human mind to understand the mind of the eternal God and His ways of dealing with the children of men.

(1) The testimony against war is, in reality, a claim on behalf of Christ that His demand on the individual is *absolute*. When the Church began to calculate in terms of her relation to the State she, of necessity, qualified the absoluteness of the demand of Christ. There are a vast number of circumstances which can be quoted as justifying (supposedly) some qualification of the Sermon on the Mount. We can easily demonstrate that it is utterly impracticable in this modern world, that it is an ideal for ultimate achievement and not for immediate use. The instinct that forbids the Christian

to fight breaks right through the whole tissue of argument on which compromise is founded. It says, "This is the law of Christ, and I know no other."[6] It cannot wait and weigh all the contending loyalties. It reaches out at once to the ideal. Such are the men who take the Kingdom by storm. Did Christ preach such an ethic, or did He merely expect us to reach, by slow age-long processes, to an approximation to the ideal state? On the answer to this question hangs our whole conception of the Kingdom of God. No doubt the orthodox tradition of centuries has taken one view—a view which seems at last to find a philosophic basis in the theory of evolution, applied somewhat recklessly to moral progress. The instinct referred to will not accept this view even with its apparent philosophic verification. It regards this as a fundamental error and apostasy. It boldly claims that Christ came to oppose ruthlessly and utterly every form of evil, however closely it was woven into the fabric of society, that He believed in a Kingdom which was not of this world, to be established by complete loyalty to God, and that He was prepared to accept in Himself on the Cross the full result of this revolutionary theory. To those who hold this view the Cross is not merely something to be admired—a glorious drama of divine love enacted once for all. It contains the secret of human progress. To take up the Cross is to go the way the Master went, to stand out to the last against evil of every kind, and to die for it—as we inevitably must if we truly do this. Christ's demand is that we forsake all, that we "hate" parents and brethren for His sake. In this view there can be no patience with the long-drawn argument about contending loyalties. This loyalty makes the inexorable demand upon

[6]It seems necessary here to distinguish between "absolute" and "literal" obedience. We contend that the protest against war is not a "literal" obedience to specific commands, which was not Christ's method of inculcating truth, but that it is an "absolute" obedience to the whole spirit of His teaching.

us. If Christ forbids us to slay our fellow-men, or even to hate them, it cannot matter in the least what the State says. For us there is no question of choice. The State may utterly collapse, our houses may be invaded, our wives and children slain. Such a defeat may be the surest victory. Any victory which means a surrender of this ideal can only spell defeat even to the ideals for which we have fought.

This carries us right down to our deepest thought about God and His ways with men. Over against all this view of the Kingdom, there is another totally different, intellectually attractive, peculiarly modern. But the question of all others for the Church is, Which view is Christ's? Unquestionably the answer which is easiest is that He also believed in the slow process. It justifies our makeshifts, and all the "necessary" adjustments of modern life. For a moment it may seem easy to break loose and die. But in reality the path of the Cross must ever be intensely hard. Is it not very difficult for the mere theologian to seize to the fullest extent this view of the Kingdom? Must we not go back to the saint and find what he has himself discovered, and then reverently seek to check this by the record of our Lord's life and teaching? The path is still made clear to him who willeth to do the will of God; it is still revealed to babes and sucklings.

Two things remain to be said. In the first place the right by which our Lord exercises this authority is no arbitrary one, it is the inherent right which belongs to that which is wholly good. We yield to Him in utter loyalty because we see in Him that which is in itself worthy of our devotion. Thus we find Him to be perfect man and "very God". In the second place, this being so, all other loyalties will be found to be fulfilled in the fulfilment of this. There may be an apparent conflict of loyalties. In reality we are the truest citizens as we follow Christ in this absolute way.

(2) The testimony against war involves, further, a full acceptance of the belief in the supremacy of the spiritual forces. If we are to turn aside from faith in armies and fleets, we can only do so because we cast ourselves altogether on some other force. The Kingdom of God is not of this world, and for this reason Christ's servants cannot fight. Their task is to win by persuasion, by the power of a pure life, by the infection of implicit faith. In name the Church stands committed to this ideal. In point of fact she denies it. She is entrenched behind wealth and influence. Even when she offers her prayer to God, saying there is none other that fighteth for her, she is blessing the armies and navies which are a denial of this faith. Here, again, there are two opposing theories. We may believe that all these outward things are to be used, and used to the full. Having used them all, we come to God to ask His blessing upon them, or when, at the last moment, they fail us, we may turn to Him in despair. On the other hand, we may throw ourselves entirely upon God, utterly refusing to use any means which is not entirely consistent with what we know of His nature, and continuing to make this refusal up to the very last point, believing that either He will deliver in some way we may not comprehend, or that defeat itself will be His best way for us.

Absolute loyalty needs to be reinforced by this absolute faith. Repeatedly during His life our Lord turned away from the use of questionable means for the fulfilment of His high mission, until, at the last, He sheathed His disciple's sword, and resisted the temptation to call twelve legions of angels to His rescue. What it meant for Him was death, the apparent defeat of His cause, the forsaking of His nearest friends. God crowned that defeat with the greatest victory the world has ever seen. When Christ rose again, He brought into human life a new power for the overcoming of evil, and a new con-

viction that, in the end, good must triumph if it be utterly relied upon. Does not the instinct which prevented men from taking up arms, even in self-defence or in the defence of those who are dearer than life, lead us straight back to the kind of faith which the Church ought to have today? Does it not show us how far we have fallen from this high standard?

(3) The testimony against war involves an assertion of the brotherhood of man, and of the claim of men of all nations and races to an equal place in the Kingdom of God. The ideal of the Church is essentially inclusive in relation to nationality. Its claim to have a message for any part of the human race rests upon principles which apply equally to every other part. It grounds its appeal to men on those things which all men have in common, and not on those which divide nation from nation.

Over against the universal conception of the Church, there is a constant tendency to conceive of it in less than universal terms. Groups of like-minded persons who can pronounce the same shibboleth, who must worship together in exactly the same way, or work on the same lines, gather together, and regard themselves as the chosen remnant to the exclusion of all others. The subdivisions of Protestantism have too often illustrated this. We are ready enough to recognize today that everything which is sectional and exclusive, and so narrows down the breadth of the love of God into our little human channels, is diametrically opposed to the true ideal of the Church. But how easy to see this from without, and how hard to see it from within!

It is perfectly true that the Church has a mission to the nation. She has also a mission to the individual and to the family; but she has no mission to the individual which cuts him off from other individuals, or to the family which isolates it from other families. She should lead the individual to find his true life not only in com-

munion with God, but also in fellowship with and service for his brethren. She should lead the nation to find its true life, and to purify and fulfil its national ideal, in fellowship with other nations and in the common service of humanity. Whenever the ideal of a catholic Church becomes subordinated to the national ideal, there is grave peril both to the Church and to the State. It is almost impossible that a Church which is purely national, or whose members are confined to the citizens of one State, should not, at some point, identify the interests of the State and those of the Kingdom of God. When national ideals clash, it is almost certain that national Churches will be ranged each on the side of its own nation, and that what appears to be good for the nation will appear also to be in the interests of the Church of Christ. While in any one nation, at a time of war, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the majority of the members of the Church to see wherein the difference lies between the supposed interests of the nation and those of the Kingdom of God, it is, nevertheless, perfectly evident that, when great so-called "Christian" nations are fighting against one another, the national Churches in each of them cannot both be right. It is, in fact, much more reasonable to suppose that the interests of the Kingdom of God must, in some way, transcend the issues for which either nation is contending, and which the national Church in each case is defending as the very truth of God. There could be no better commentary on the danger of this division of the Churches, and especially the division into national groups, than the war which is taking place in Europe today.

(4) The testimony against war involves us in an assertion of the value of the individual, and a protest against his absorption in the mass. The war machine, as we see it today, has sucked in multitudes of men, and it regards them merely as fighting units, to obey,

whatever their own conscience may say, to march forward in disciplined array to slay or be slain. Although the military methods of some of the combatants may seem to emphasize this more than in the case of others, the same theory is latent in all military training and action. The general cannot stop to think of the individual, either of his life or of his conscience. Men become, for the time being, part of one huge machine of destruction. The fact that we send out our armies and navies to kill men wholesale emphasizes this from another point of view. It is no mere ethical problem as to the use of force. Living men with souls for whom Christ died are the objects at which our guns are aimed. They may even be partakers with us in the full, free life of God. They are not guilty criminals. They are men with homes and children, with hopes and fears, with love and pity like ourselves. But they are caught up in the machine. For the time being they exist only as enemies to be destroyed.

Over against all this is the perpetual witness of the Son of God to the inherent worth of the individual. He never lost sight of the unit in the mass. He speaks of a Father who knows when even a sparrow falls to the ground. The Church which truly represents His spirit cannot accept this utter neglect of the individual. It is called to witness to that which he is in the sight of God, to seek to save each one, however humble or depraved. All that neglects, overrides, crushes, slays innocent men and women, whether in commercial war, in the sweated industry, or in international strife, is altogether contrary to the deepest essence of the Master's teaching, and to the whole trend of His life on earth. One and one and one He sought and found and saved them. We go forth, calling on His name, forsooth, to mow them down rank on rank. When men, for the love of Christ, have felt within them the burning revolt against taking part in war, have they not been true to

one of the deepest lessons of His wondrous life of compassion?

(5) And this brings us to the last great Christian truth which is bound up with this testimony. The Church stands for the faith that in Jesus Christ was made plain to men the essential nature of the living God. His life breathes one spirit—and that spirit is love. Throughout His life He showed forth love, and in His death He threw Himself utterly on God, loving men to the last, and turning away from every weapon which love could not sanctify, and every thought which love could not own. In that supreme act we are taught that, if evil is to be overcome in the world, even the eternal God has no surer weapon than self-sacrificing love.

In all the warring nations today men are being urged from pulpits into this war in order to overcome great evils—Russian barbarism, Prussian militarism, British hypocrisy, international bad-faith. But how? By force of arms; by means which cannot be owned by perfect love; by destroying our brothers; by filling our sisters' hearts with sorrow. If this be not a denial of the thing for which Christ died, what is?

The fact is we have not dared to try the method of love, and now we almost seem to be driven to defy it openly.

"Good-heartedness, when not strictly limited, is inconvenient to every community man has yet organized; it has often been regarded as a vice, always as a source of blindness. At our highest point of civilization we have regarded tender-heartedness as the purest virtue only where cultivated by, and under regulation of, reason. We have never regarded it as a source of divine light, and set reason to worship it.

"The cause of this is clear. From examination of the world as it is, it is rational to conclude that the person, or the community, that followed the promptings of tender-heartedness, totally ignoring the promptings of hard-heartedness, would be swept from the face of the earth. The only consideration that could make all passive and active antagonisms appear iniquitous would be the belief that there was some Power—transcendent, immanent—behind the power of human tenderness, a Power that was able, through that instrument, to subdue the world to itself. Now, that seems to have been, if we could receive it, exactly what our Lord believed and taught."[7]

[7] *Practice of Christianity*, pp. 68, 69.

Behind the testimony against war we get back to this stupendous conviction, which seems to break out with revolutionary force. Through the instrument of human tenderness, the living God is, we believe, able to break into human life to a degree and extent that we have not dreamed. The Church needs to know this breaking out of divine power. The world stands in need of it more than any words can express. Not long ago Prof. Eucken, looking out on the modern world situation, wrote:

"The only antidote, then, to the soullessness of modern culture and the starving of all inward life is a return to the deepening and quickening forces of religion. But our statement of the case has shown further that the revival of religion leads direct to Christianity. The world-service which Christianity has rendered in the building up of a new world and the elevation of mankind is absolutely indispensable for religious progress. The present day, in particular, with its moral slackness, stands in urgent need of rousing and regeneration *through the moral earnestness of Christianity*. In the bosom of Christianity unfathomable forces are slumbering, forces which have by no means lived themselves out, and are still capable of breaking forth again and driving human life into new channels with an irresistible and elemental violence. The contact of divine and human begets daimonic forces which may work either for revolution and renewal or for destruction and desolation. To gain control of these, and lead them into the paths of productive work, is one main task of the religious community. But the particular way of apprehending this task may, in the lapse of time, become narrow and stereotyped. Then arises the need of appealing from it to the primal force itself, and summoning this to a task of new creation."[8]

That primal force is revealed to us as — Love. The appeal to love in a heroic and whole-hearted way may yet cause the slumbering forces to break forth and drive our life into new and better channels. But how are we to make the appeal to love? Can we do so while we are trammelled with the national point of view, while we are compromising at every turn, while we are trusting to our material defences, and to our wealth and conventional goodness?

The Church has need to speak with one voice from all her severed parts. The fact is that she is divided,

[8] *Can We Still Be Christians?* pp. 211, 212.

and, therefore, impotent when a great world-crisis comes suddenly upon her. There is no unifying power and principle, and no sufficient conception of the common good which might enable her to stand before the warring nations and call them, in the name of Christ, into the way of peace. Her supreme mission is reconciliation. She is at war within herself, how can she reconcile the nations? "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, because ye have love one to another." But the world does not know it, for we do not manifest that love. It is not so operative within the body of Christ as to prevent her from calling her sons to slay one another. The Church stands aside ashamed to confess that the eternal ideals of the Kingdom of God do not move men as do the passing ideals of national welfare. Where are we to look for a way out of our strife and discord and into a surer message for distracted humanity?

What the world needs is not that the Church should be less Christian, but that she should be more Christian, not that she should lower her standard by compromise with the world, but that she should raise it incomparably higher, not that she should make a less demand on the loyalty of men, but a greater and more exacting one. This is the change in the Church which will rally to her flag the many thoughtful men in all walks of life who today stand aloof. This is the change that will make her once more a power—not with temporal arms, but in the might of an irresistible spiritual conviction.

If we are to find a new inspiration and a new unity, do we not need to go back and find out, with all the force of a fresh discovery, some of these great fundamental truths to which we are giving lip service, but which mean so little to us in our modern life? As we draw nearer to the men who walked with Christ, as we look with fearless eyes into what He Himself has said and done, we may make together such discoveries as shall revolutionize our thinking and our doing, and draw us once

more together as the children of one family around the Father's feet.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war, a young Slav student in Switzerland came to his professor and told him that he had been led to feel that he could not, as a Christian, take up arms in any cause. He was an Austrian subject, and had received his mobilization paper. He had determined to obey the summons and report himself at his own village, though he knew that to do so meant death. His professor urged him to desist. The young student could not be turned from his course. His professor, describing the interview, writes: "It was a moment of unique emotion. I was in the presence of primitive Christianity." The student went back to Austria, and was shot for refusing to serve with the forces. Had he discovered something which the Church today has lost?

Newman and Bright

By Charles Allen Dinsmore, D.D.

I

Newman and Bright have been chosen for this sketch largely because their biographies—Ward's *Life and Letters of Cardinal Newman*, and Trevelyan's *Life of John Bright*—have so recently appeared. The two men lived in the same century, in the same country, and for a portion of the time were identified with the same city. In the stormy days that were upon England during the middle of the nineteenth century, each was a leader of conspicuous talent and of large following; yet the circumference of their interests and activities at no point intersected. They lived in different worlds. In Bright's biography no reference is made to Newman, and the index of Ward's stately volumes contains no mention of the most eloquent champion of social justice in those tumultuous times. The spheres of thoughts, ideals, emotions in which these two men lived and had their being were as far apart as Jupiter and Saturn. In 1845 when England was seething with the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Law, and Cobden and Bright were leading a mighty and clamant host to victory, Newman was writing in his journal: "The simple question is, Can I be saved in the English Church? Am I in safety, were I to die tonight?"

Unlike in interests and in character as were these two men, they had a few qualities in common. Each was a preacher of righteousness of consummate power. The spell which Newman's sermons cast upon Oxford has

been incomparably described by Principal Shairp from whom we quote a few sentences:

"A mysterious veneration had by degrees gathered around him till now it was almost as though some Ambrose or Augustine of older ages had appeared. . . . The centre from which his power went forth was the pulpit of St. Mary's, with those wonderful afternoon sermons, Sunday after Sunday. . . To call these sermons eloquent would be no word for them; high poems they rather were, as of an inspired singer, or the outpourings of a prophet wrapt, yet self-possessed. . . . Through the silence of that high Gothic building the words fell on the ear like the measured drippings of water in some vast cave. After hearing these sermons you might come away still not believing in the tenets of the High Church system; but you would be harder than most men, if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness, if you did not feel the things of faith brought nearer the soul."

Equally noble and graphic is Trevelyan's description of Bright's oratory:

"His voice had a bell-like clearness; in the largest hall he never strained, and scarcely seemed to raise it. The sound of it was music and poetry. . . . His oncoming was as the surge of the full swollen tide, not of the sea in storm; he awed his hearers by the calm of his passion, a terrible steed restrained by a yet stronger hand. Thus he uttered his plain man's prophecy to his fellow citizens, bidding them keep the paths of peace and freedom, righteousness and good sense, when statesmen and diplomats, as ever, led them astray."

Lord Salisbury paid him this tribute:

"He was the greatest master of English oratory that this generation has produced, or, I may say, of several generations back. I have met men who have heard Pitt and Fox, and in whose judgment their eloquence at its best was inferior to the finest efforts of John Bright."

Differing widely as the poles in churchmanship, their opinions of the Anglican service were quite similar. Bright writes in his journal of September, 1873:

"Hawarden. To church. Service high. Three persons. Mr. Gladstone most earnest in the singing, etc. To me much of the service seemed only fitted for very ignorant people."

It was at one time rumoured that Newman would return to the church of his youth; to quiet the report he wrote, declaring that "Protestantism is the dreariest of all religions." Earlier he spoke bitterly of the Anglican service as

"a ritual dashed to the ground, trodden on and broken in piecemeal; prayers clipped, pieced, shuffled about at pleasure until the meaning of the composition perished."

II

But the contrasts between the two are more noticeable than their similarities. The supreme loyalty of Newman was given to the Church; Bright laboured to establish the Kingdom of God. The passion of the one was for individual holiness; of the other for social justice. One would revive the spirit of antiquity; the other the spirit of brotherhood. Self-disclosure was a passion with Newman. His subtle mind was by nature introspective. His sermons searched the hidden places of the heart, analysing every motive and assessing the value of every virtue. He so clearly mirrored the souls of others because he understood his own so well. Supersensitive and egoistic, he held tenaciously in memory whatever in any way affected him. No wonder the *Apologia* is one of the greatest documents of the Spirit in the English tongue for its author was following the strong bent of his genius in thus laying bare and dissecting the delicate workings of his complex and extraordinary nature. We are glad that Newman had this peculiar egoism. It has saved to the world many accents of the Holy Ghost. After having followed through many pages the deep and mysterious ways of Newman's spiritual pilgrimage, it is with a sense of entering a refreshing and wholesome atmosphere that one comes within the circle of Bright's rugged humility. He could not be interested in a possible biography. "My life is in my speeches," summed up his thought of the matter. Yet with all his self-revelation, Newman remains a veiled and illusive figure, charming the pen of many writers; while the simple and intelligible character of Bright presents no problem and is seldom discussed. Yet Newman, most introspective of men, looked outward for guidance and authority, and Bright, absorbed in bettering external conditions, sought the Inner Light for direction and certainty. The man of subjective temperament rested in the most formal of

religions, and the man of affairs believed in the most subjective of faiths. The religion of each was complemental to his nature.

They differed in their methods of reading the purposes of Divine Providence in their lives. John Bright heard the call of God in the needs of humanity. Having determined his goal, he fought his way towards it with unflagging strength and quenchless ardour. The more towering the difficulty the more strenuous were his efforts. Newman, on the other hand, followed the line of least resistance. A really formidable obstacle in his way he regarded as a divine indication that he should not walk therein. He continually scrutinized the shifting conditions of his life for a sign of the will of God. His motto was, "Thy will be done." Bright's was, "Trust God, and fear not." Together they form an excellent illustration of Goethe's dictum, "Talent forms itself in solitude; character in the great currents of the world."

III

If our study is to be valuable, we must delve deeper than these individual peculiarities, and endeavour to understand through the characters and careers of these two men the intellectual and spiritual needs of two divergent temperaments. The names by which these two foci of the religious world are known today are Catholic, or High Church, and Protestant. These names, having so many associations, are not very satisfactory. But they will serve as well as any to preserve the distinction we have in mind.

Newman was by nature a Catholic. Although born in a home where evangelical influences were dominant, he early revealed the High Church aptitudes of his mind. Even as a child, among a thousand objects which met his eye, he selected a cross encircled by a rosary to adorn his verse book.

"My imagination," he says, "ran on unknown influences, on magical powers and talismans. I thought that life might be a dream, or I an angel, and all the world a deception."

He was enamoured before he was sixteen with Augustine and the Fathers, and was convinced that his calling in life would involve celibacy. At Oxford he early assented to the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, and the worth of tradition. The Rev. William James taught him the dogma of Apostolic Succession in a single walk around Christ Church meadows, so congenial was that conception to his mind.

"From the age of fifteen," he declares, "dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion: I know no other religion; I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion; religion as a mere sentiment is a dream and a mockery."

What he believed at fifteen he believed to the end. Neither did he ever swerve from the conviction that there is a divinely established, visible Church with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace. Newman's only change was in his attitude towards the Church in communion with Rome. His fundamental assumptions were the same from youth to old age. Dogma, divinely revealed and authenticated, and a visible Church, episcopally organized by heavenly authority, were ever to him basic beliefs and spiritual necessities.

He distrusted and vigorously opposed the democratic principle both in church and state. The faith of Bright in the plain people was utterly alien to his mind. He viewed the famous reform bill of 1832, and every extension of the franchise that came after it, with steady abhorrence. When the Bourbons were dismissed from France he declared "that it was unchristian for nations to cast off their governors, and, much more, sovereigns who had the divine right of inheritance." When in French waters he refused to look upon the tricolor, considering it to be a sacrilegious emblem. In 1885 he writes to Dean Church:

"What a dreadful thing democracy is! How I wish Gladstone had retired into private life, as he seems to have contemplated doing some ten years ago."

His special abhorrence was Liberalism. This he fought with all the ardour of his nature and all the resources of his subtle and powerful mind. Liberalism he defined as "a denial of the dogmatic principle," "the exercise of thought on matters in which, from the constitution of the mind, thought cannot be brought to a successful issue." His problem was to find a church which could speak with divine authority. United and holy, it must be as the very presence of the Living God amid the welter of human passion and worldliness. The actual Church of England did not fulfil this ideal. Not finding the church of his aspirations in the present, he sought for it in the past. This pure and united *Ecclesia* he found in the first centuries when Christianity was conquering the world, before the corrupt influence of the Roman Empire had soiled her white garments. To recover the sanctity and spiritual authority of the primitive Church to the Establishment in England was the purpose of the Tractarian movement, of which Newman was the leader. His ardent propaganda was carried on, not among the people, but among their shepherds. His success was extraordinary. In the five years from 1833 to 1838, by means of his learning, the persuasive charm of his writing, his eloquence and fervent enthusiasm, he created a powerful and aggressive High Church party in England. Then the confident and inspired leader began to lose his inner assurance, and to grope for a sure path. His historical studies led him to suspect that, like the Arians and the Donatists, the Church in which he was born was schismatic. Relying too much on private judgment, it had cut itself off from the main body of the Church. It was Apostolic but not Catholic. The words of Augustine, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum . . .*" ("Therefore the entire world judges with

security that they are not good who separate themselves from the entire world, in whatever part of the world"), quoted by Cardinal Wiseman, smote like the voice of God on the soul of Newman, and sent him to Rome. Through those ancient words he saw that the pronouncements of the Church of England were not the secure judgments of the entire world.

The parting with old friends and loyalties caused him great agony of spirit. He kissed the leaves of Oxford trees when he left his beloved university. When the great separation was approaching, Albany Christie walked with him from Oxford to Littlemore. Newman never spoke a word all the way, and Christie's hand when they arrived was wet with Newman's tears. On Oct. 9th, 1845, three days after Renan put off his clerical habit and left the Roman Church, Newman was received into it. There followed seven years of comparative influence in the Roman Church, then his active original mind alarmed the conservative officials who sat in high places, and the doors of larger service which he longed to enter were closed to him. In 1860 he writes in his journal:

"O my God, I seem to have wasted these years that I have been a Catholic. What I wrote as a Protestant has had far greater power, force, meaning, success, than my Catholic work, and that troubles me a great deal."

Later he wrote to an Anglican friend:

"I have found in the Catholic Church abundance of courtesy, but very little sympathy among persons in high places, except a few, but there is a depth and a power in the Catholic religion, a fulness of satisfaction in its creed, its theology, its rites, its sacraments, its discipline, a freedom yet a support also, before which the neglect or misapprehension about oneself on the part of individual living persons, however exalted, is as so much dust when weighed in the balance. This is the true secret of the Church's strength, the principle of its indefectibility and the bond of its indissoluble unity. It is the earnest and the beginning of the repose of heaven."

On his memorial slab were engraved the words which he thought best interpreted the journey of his pilgrim spirit: "*Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem.*"

Newman was perhaps the finest spiritual genius of his century. His was certainly one of the most searching, disciplined and profound minds of that stirring epoch. One sentence at the beginning of the *Apologia* reveals the nature and limitations of his genius and lays bare the causes which controlled his career. Writing of his early experience, he affirms that he rested

"in the thought of two and two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator. . . . From a boy I had been led to consider that my Maker and I, His creature, were the two beings, certainly such, *in rerum natura*."

This glowing sense of the presence of God was the benignant Light which never failed Newman in all his shadowed days. Likewise his commanding consciousness of self accounts for that splendid egoism which made his genius introspective and his dogmatic temper possible.

He is equally frank in disclosing the darkness which beset him.

"Starting then," he writes in the *Apologia*, "with the being of a God (which, as I have said, is as certain to me as the certainty of my own existence, though when I try to put the grounds of that certainty into logical shape I find a difficulty in doing so in mood and figure to my satisfaction), I look out of myself into the world of men, and there I see a sight which fills me with unspeakable distress. The world seems simply to give the lie to that great truth, of which my whole being is so full; and the effect upon me is, in consequence, as a matter of necessity, as confusing as if it denied that I am in existence myself. If I looked into a mirror, and did not see my face, I should have the sort of feeling which actually comes upon me, when I look into this living busy world, and see no reflection of its Creator. This is, to me, one of the great difficulties of this absolute primary truth, to which I referred just now. Were it not for this voice, speaking so clearly in my conscience and my heart, I should be an atheist, or a pantheist, or a polytheist, when I looked into the world. . . . What shall be said to this heart-piercing, reason-bewildering fact? I can only answer . . . supposing then it to be the Will of the Creator to interfere in human affairs, and to make provisions for retaining in the world a knowledge of Himself, so definite and distinct as to be proof against the energy of human scepticism, in such a case—I am far from saying there was no other way—but there is nothing to surprise the mind, if He should think fit to introduce a power into the world, invested with the prerogative of infallibility in religious matters. Such a provision would be a direct, immediate, active, and prompt means of withstanding the difficulty; it would be an instrument suited to the need; and when I find that this is the very claim of the

Catholic Church, not only do I feel no difficulty in admitting the idea, but there is a fitness in it, which recommends it to my mind."

Here then is the strength and weakness of Newman's mind. He had a vivid intuition of the transcendent God, but he could not see the Divine mirrored in the affairs of men. There is a type of mind, of which the loftiest of the prophets of Israel and the great humanitarians are examples, possessed by a conviction, which does not arise from surface optimism but is in the root centre of their being, that God is with and in humanity, working out His redemptive purposes on the field of human history. The glory and presence of this immanent God Newman failed to behold. On the face of the deep he did not see the Spirit brooding. Therefore he sought for some witness in the world to the God who was so luminously evident to his own soul. This witness he believed must be direct, self-evidencing, and infallible. There must be some fact in history to authenticate the facts of consciousness. That God should introduce into the chaos of human unreason and passion a Church universal, continuous, authoritative, seemed to him eminently reasonable. Believing in a transcendent God whose witness was, not the orderly process of nature and the achievements of men, but a visible and infallible Church, he had no difficulty in crediting this Church with miraculous powers.

"I think it impossible," he says, "to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. I see no reason to doubt the material of the Lombard crown at Monza, and I do not see why the Holy Coat at Treves may not have been what it professes to be. . . . I firmly believe that before now Saints have raised the dead to life, crossed the seas without vessels, multiplied grain and bread, cured incurable diseases, and stopped the operations of the laws of the universe in a multitude of ways."

Newman's personal aspiration was for holiness. He craved, to use his own expression in the *Dream of Geron-*

tius, to partake of that

> "keen sanctity
> Which with its effulgence, like a glory, clothes
> And circles round the Crucified."

He found in the New Testament an other-worldliness, a detachment from temporal concerns which fascinated him. In the early Church he discovered ideals of a severe and awful holiness, a conscious union with God, whose attainment seemed to him a beatitude above all earthly blessings. This lofty ideal he found congenial to the Roman Church and developed by her discipline and sacraments, and he found it nowhere else. To him the distance separating a smug British parson from the shining holiness of a Catholic saint was appalling. Instinctively he turned to a church which has produced and honoured sanctity, and maintained it in unbroken succession. He was athirst for God and he found Him, and became a partaker of His nature.

Newman was, by the constitution of his mind, a High Churchman, and he saw God where all High Churchmen see Him—on the throne. Experiencing a transcendent, monarchical God, he could conceive of the Church only as monarchical in its constitution. The conceptions of democracy were necessarily alien to his mind. The kind of God his intuition revealed made it impossible for him not to hold the divine right of kings and the special endowment of priests as part of his creed.

Both his light and his darkness determined Newman's path, but the path led him into the power, the joy, the consolations of religion.

IV

Passing from the study of Newman to the study of John Bright, one has the feeling that he is leaving a stately cathedral with its wondrous shadows and its mystical windows for the simple and wholesome light of common day. Bright offers no interesting problem to the psychologist. His mind is like an open book. His record is

written, not in varying emotions, shifting convictions and changing loyalties, but in the prosperity and vigour of a nation. He was healthy minded and once born. The massive and noble grandeur of his character is unquestioned.

His summons in his thirtieth year to a life of service he has described in inimitable words.

"It was near the middle of September, when there fell upon me one of the heaviest blows that can visit any man. I found myself with none living in my home but a motherless child. Mr. Cobden called upon me the day after that event, so terrible to me and so prostrating. He said, after some conversation, 'Don't allow this grief, great as it is, to weigh you down too much. There are at this moment, in thousands of homes in this country, wives and children who are dying of hunger—of hunger made by the law. If you will come with me, we will never rest till we have got rid of the Corn Law.'"

The condition of the agricultural labourers of England was indeed deplorable. In the south they were reduced almost to the level of the Polish serfs. In Leeds forty thousand persons were subsisting on charity. In some districts of Leeds and Manchester five hundred and seventy out of every thousand died before attaining the age of five. Among the persons in comfortable circumstances in the same district the death rate was only seventy to a thousand. Bright believed he could best save his own soul by giving to other people a chance to save theirs. He plunged into the fight for social justice. He was a most potent force for the repeal of the Corn Law; he spoke straight to the conscience of the nation in his denunciation of the Crimean war; he held the common people true to the fundamental ideas of liberty during our civil strife; he was the resistless champion of an enlarged franchise—a reform releasing those energies which ultimately swept away the three privileges dear to Churchmen—Church establishment, Church rates, and the exclusion of Dissenters from the universities. Losing his life he found it. The sheer weight and majesty of his moral character spoke more persua-

sively to his countrymen than the music of his speech, and made him eminently influential in his generation.

The source of these abundant activities and the secret of his impressive character was religion.

"Deep in Bright's heart," says his biographer, "there was always something serene, something reserved and solitary. . . . The presence of deep feeling and meditation could be felt as the moving power of all that he did. . . . He practised the silence of his sect, and drew thence the strength of his soul, the purity of his heart, and the quality of his speech."

Newman has characterized such religion as "mere sentiment, a dream and a mockery," but it accomplished the supreme end of religion—faith towards God and mercy and righteousness towards man.

"Though he appeared," says Trevelyan, "the simplest man who ever played a part in the annals of our island, the union in him of two rival simplicities renders him, in a sense, a strange, almost mysterious being; for the hard-hitting and implacable champion of truth and right was also a most compassionate lover of his kind. In him was blended the Old Testament and the New, the two indispensable contradictories, that man must learn to reconcile in his own breast or else remain till doomsday the thing he is. By careful search some of the rudiments of these opposites can be found in each of us, but in none did they come to such double perfection as in John Bright."

Lord Morley has said that

"the most impressive and pure piece of religion he ever witnessed was John Bright reading the Bible to his maid servants shortly after his wife's death, in his beautiful and feeling voice, followed by the Quaker silence."

Even John Bright could not enter the struggle for social justice without reckoning with and setting aside a religious ideal not entirely dissimilar to that which Newman followed. Quietism was the prevailing type of Quakerism in those days. The leading spirits of the sect commanded seclusion from an evil world. Bright's father said to an acquaintance: "I don't like my son pushing himself to the front like this." And to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Priestman, who remonstrated with him, Bright wrote:

"I trust I am often deeply concerned that so much active and public occupation should not succeed in injuring better feelings and

higher objects. . . . I know there is this danger. I hope I strive against it, and I endeavour to pray that it may not overcome me. But conscious of the increasing hazard we run owing to the long continuance of monopolies, and beholding the appalling sufferings of multitudes of my fellow creatures and satisfied that all benevolence and charity and the teaching of religion and of schools fall short of much of their full effect owing to the degraded and impoverished condition of the people—I should feel myself guilty, as possessing abundance and leaving others to hunger, nakedness and immorality and deepest ignorance and crime, if I were to retire into domestic quiet and leave the struggle to be carried on by others."

How utterly different is this point of view from that of Newman when he wrote:

"The Church would rather save the soul of one poor whining beggar of Naples, or of one poor brigand of Palermo, than cover Italy with railroads."

It was the calm power of religion at the centre of his being that enabled Bright to be a tribune of the people without appealing to class hatred, and saved him from the two characteristic sins of the agitator—bitterness and exaggeration. In this he differed from Wendell Phillips, who deliberately employed envenomed speech and unqualified assertions to attract attention to his cause, and who paid the penalty in a waning influence and in a countenance devoid of the "lineaments of gospel books." Truthfulness was at the very heart of Bright. It was the vital part of his speeches as well as of his character.

"Now more than thirty years ago," he says, "when I was very young indeed, only beginning to think about public affairs, in reading the prose writings of John Milton, I found a passage that fixed itself in my mind. This passage time has never been able to take from my memory. He says, 'Yet true eloquence I find to be none but a serious and hearty love of truth.' And I have endeavoured as far as I have had opportunity of speaking in public to abide by that wise and weighty saying. So far as I have been able to examine myself during the thirty years that I have been permitted to speak at meetings of my fellow countrymen, I am not conscious that I have used an argument which I did not believe to be sound, or have stated anything as a fact which I did not believe to be true."

The quality of Bright's character was quite unlike the sanctity which crowned Newman's later years, but

it won the applause of a nation and elicited from Gladstone this encomium:

> "The supreme eulogy I apprehend to be his due is this: that he lifted political life to a higher elevation and a loftier standard, and that he has bequeathed to his country the character of a statesman who can be made the subject not only of admiration, and not only of gratitude, but even of what I do not exaggerate in calling, as it has well been called by one of his admirers, the object of reverential contemplation."

V

The supreme aspirations of religious men are for a knowledge of God, stability of faith, peace, power, joy, and holiness. These are the promised fruits of Christianity, and these Bright conspicuously attained. God was to him, all through his stormy career, a luminous Reality. His faith was stable. He saw God's presence in the world as clearly as Newman saw Him in the Church. The glory he beheld was not manifested in the miracles of the saints, but in the Spirit of love, justice, and truth, which is in the world battling for righteousness. His, too, was an inner serenity ever deepening. He grew in power over his fellows as they recognized the moral elevation of his character, and his joy was the joy of battles bravely fought and of duty nobly done. As the ideals and disciplines of his life were different from those of Newman, so was the resulting character different. His was not the gentle other-worldliness of the Catholic, but he achieved those rugged, homely virtues which won the reverential admiration of his contemporaries. Religion ministered to Bright as truly as to Newman, and through him worked as effectively for the things of God. To Bright religion consisted in obeying the First and the Second Commandments, and in having the Christlike spirit. The Church was the brotherhood of believers participating in the spirit of Christ. To Newman this seemed unsubstantial sentiment. To one dogma was a fallible statement of opinion, divisive in its nature; to the

other it was the articulate word of the Highest. Spiritual authority was indispensable to Newman. Bright wondered how "people who can tell us so much about the next world should know so little about the present." One searched the past for wisdom; the other declared, "We are the true ancients, we stand on the shoulders of our forefathers and can see further." One believed intensely in civil and religious liberty, while the other sincerely dreaded it. To the one Christianity was a *life*, and faith was the courage to live it; to the other Christianity was a system of revealed *truth*, and faith was knowledge and obedience. One sought the simplicity that is in Christ; the other longed to receive of His fulness. To Newman the fulness of Christ was revealed in the wisdom and glory of the Church; to Bright it was manifested in the just and free institutions which His spirit has built up in the world. To one the way of life was so obscure that an infallible guide was needed; to the other the way was so plain that the wayfaring man need not err therein.

These two temperaments of which Newman and Bright are eminent examples appear in all religious history. With their mutual attractions and repulsions they have been the two poles making the world of religious thought and activity. In Israel they took the forms of priest and prophet. In our day they confront each other as Catholic and Protestant. The Catholic mind is the priestly mind moulded by the influences of the Middle Ages. It was developed as a distinct type between the third and the sixteenth centuries. There is no evidence of anything like it in either Greece or Rome. The priestly temper has always existed. Supplemented by dogma, it becomes Catholic. The Protestant mind is the prophetic temper trained and fashioned by the battles and responsibilities of the past three centuries. These tempers are fastened deep in human nature. Each has found a way to God, but the Kindly Light which leads one is darkness to the other.

VI

What has been written may serve to persuade us that the divisions of Christendom are not entirely the result of ancient rebellions and inherited prejudices. On the contrary, many of them are the outgrowths of those temperamental characteristics by which the Creator has enriched human nature. Yet so divergent are the types of mind which we have been considering that men of these contradictory temperaments with difficulty understand each other. To bring the extreme Catholic and the extreme Protestant together in faith and worship seems impossible to our present wisdom. Even if Newman and Bright could have found by searching a common ground of religious belief and practice, it would have inspired the loyalty of neither. Had both come out from those customs and observances which had hitherto nourished their spirits, and attempted to abide together in an organization constructed of common agreements, the rich soul of Newman would have felt pauperized amid the naked simplicities, and the free spirit of Bright would have chafed as in a prison.

Newman recognized how fundamental are the differences separating spiritually minded people, and in his later years greatly deplored them.

> "It seems to me," he writes, "that the first step to any chance of unity amid our divisions, is for religious minds, one and all, to live upon the Gospels."

If all members of the Family of God "live upon the Gospels" they will certainly co-operate more frequently and cordially in wise movements for the establishment of righteousness in the world. Joined in the comradeship which a stupendous task imposes, they will have for each other broader charity and profounder comprehension. Then perchance, without the sacrifice of any of the privileges and responsibilities of personality, in the divine light which always shines from the understanding heart,

they may recognize more clearly and organize effectively their spiritual unity. Until that day all may cherish Newman's hope "that our good God has not put it into the hearts of religious men to wish and pray for unity, without intending in His own time to fulfil the prayer."

Errata in December Number

Because of the war Professor Loofs' revised proofs of his article on "Lutheranism and Mysticism", in the December issue, 1914, did not arrive in time, so that the article was published without the author's correction of the translation. The Editor assumes responsibility for all mistakes and obscurities, and is relieved to hear that the original German text will be printed in a German journal.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

Why the Church—in Christianity

By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D.

A very popular evangelist was recently asked, "Are the churches, or the Church, essential to Christianity?" He is reported to have answered, indirectly and practically as follows: "If you want to get to Europe—there are the ships. If you object to the ships and think they are in the way—of course, there is swimming." I wish, in the first place, to point in the simplest way to the notorious fact that there is in our time a wide-spread disposition to dispense with the Church, or the Churches, in Christianity. None of us, I think, wish to deny that there is a great deal of Christianity outside of the Churches: Why does it so much, and apparently increasingly, prefer to remain outside? But again—within the Churches, is there not an equal disposition to make as little of the Church, and as little use of the Church, as such, as pos-

sible? Of course I know that this is true only of one of the great sections of Christianity, and that there are other sections which to this one seem to make far too much of the Church and to depend disproportionately upon its "mere" acts and offices. To those who make however much of the Church and its office, I hope that what I shall say will commend itself as true so far as it goes. To those who, even I think, make much too little, I hope it will approve itself as having in it much more of truth than most of us are in the habit of seeing or remembering. At any rate, I am going to try in this paper to mean by the Church what none of us will disclaim as being the truth and essence of it,—though some may not have consciously realized its full reality, and others may feel that fulness of it is still lacking.

The "Why" of the Church depends of course upon its "What". To know precisely What the Church is would answer completely and satisfactorily all questions of Why it is,—that is, Why it is *de jure* and why it ought to be *de facto*. The statement I shall make of it is consistently that of the New Testament taken as a whole. Already we find there all of Christianity that we know, and increasingly more of it that we know not yet and are more and more coming to know. For the fulness of knowledge depends less upon the completeness of the thing to be known than upon the growth and progress of our power to know it.

What the Church is depends immediately and wholly upon what Christ is,—for the Church is the "Body" and the "Fulness" of Christ; and the body and fulness of One are inseparable from Oneself. In the Gospel from the very beginning Christ transcends any human individuality. If He is a man, He is also Man—in a universal and inclusive sense whose beginning and end of truth and meaning we shall be for ever engaged in fathoming and understanding. But He is Man because He is not only Man, but God in Man—which is the whole and only

truth and meaning of Man. Christ is Man from three points of view: He is Man in divine Conception, in divine process or operation, and in divine consummation and fulfilment. He is thus the Past, Present, and Future of humanity. Before Abraham, or even Adam, was—He is. Because He is the divine Mind or Thought of Man above all time. Christ as Logos, or eternal reason, meaning, and end of Man, is never for one moment severed from the universal *logos*, the reason and meaning of all creation as One Whole;—but it is in that immediate and special function, of humanity as the end at least of terrestrial evolutional existence, that He is "manifested" to us in our own Gospel history.

Christ is Man, not only thus eternally in divine thought or meaning, but also temporally in humanity's own actual process of being and becoming. As Adam stands to us for humanity within the scope and activity of all that we call Nature, so Christ stands to us for that same humanity in all its predestined, accomplishing, and accomplished personal oneness with God. He is the Way; the Truth, Fact or Act; and the Fruit in Eternal Life, of Man's At-one-ment with God: that is to say, of his own conscious, free, and personally accomplished Oneness with God. He is the Oneness, potential by nature, made and become actual by the necessary reciprocal action of Grace and Faith. In the One person of Jesus Christ Humanity has actually passed, undergone transformation, regeneration, or new creation, from its own inchoate and incomplete life in ourselves into life in God, the Eternal, the Infinite, and the Perfect. The process of that transition is given us in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In one sense, which we call "in faith," we have accomplished that transition in Christ. In another sense, which we may call "in fact", the task for us in time, and, for aught we know in eternity, is to accomplish that transition in ourselves in Christ. It is God only Who can work it in us to will and to do; but God can work it

in us only in our willing and doing. Christ is God's Will and Word to work it in us; so far as He is concerned, it is done. He tells us in His Gospel how on our part, in faith, hope, and love, it shall be done just so fast as we are able to receive, appropriate and assimilate to ourselves the Word of Life which alone is able to save our souls.

Now Christ without the Church, or short of the Church, was and is an individual man. He may have been never so divine a man—never so much God in the flesh, his individual flesh; but He was not God in Man but only God in a man. He was not, and is not, *God in us.* His individual flesh was only His one natural body; the Flesh of His true and complete Incarnation was the Whole Body of our humanity. It is the Church only that is His true and abiding Body, the real Incarnation—"the Fulness of Him that filleth all in all," that which He fills with Himself as the soul or spirit fills the body and makes it all Itself. So true is it that the Church is Christ's body and self, and that we are in Him only as we are in it, that we need not hesitate at the *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,*—if we mean Christian salvation: "Christ is the Head of the Church, Himself the Saviour of the Body." As only the soul can save the body, only the spirit can sanctify and save the flesh, so only Christ as the Head and Heart, the Soul and Body, of our humanity is Christian salvation. We are fallen away from the meaning and actuality of the Church, if not of the fact of Christ Himself in the world, and of ourselves in Him, when we allow ourselves to come down to and acquiesce in the conception and use of it as a creation and matter of mere human expediency or utility. The easy and endless existence and multiplication of Churches, as against The Church, has been the natural result as well as the clear evidence of a growing loss of any real sense of the divine and necessary fact of the latter; and this, I hope, we are all more and more coming to realize and

feel. I can best indicate, perhaps, what I hope and believe to be the growing attitude of many by trying to express my own. I am commonly and popularly called an Episcopalian. I have always been much more inclined to call myself a Churchman,—and this, more and more, distinctly in the broadest instead of in (what it might easily be, and often is) the narrowest of senses. The narrow sense is, that *my* Church is The Church, which is only less far from the truth than that there is *no* "The Church",—that a Church or any Church, is only the way or form in which any body or kind of Christian embodies Christianity for itself.

The broad view is that The Church is essentially and necessarily One: that Unity is, implicitly if not explicitly, its sole and whole being and definition. The Church is Oneness with God, and oneness with all else in God. There may be, and are, churches, but only in some sectional (not sectarian) sense—in the sense of being a part of (not cut off from) the whole. There was a church in Corinth, but only as being part of The Church which is Christ. Anything more raised the question of a divided Christ. My being a Churchman therefore does not mean "Only *my* Church", in the restricted or sectional sense; it means distinctively "*not* only my Church" in that sense. I am anythingsoever else only that I may thereby be best and most a member of The Body and a partaker of the Fulness of Christ Himself. A man in order to be an American has to be something else of a narrower or more sectional designation—a New Yorker or a Tennesseean; but there is a great distinction between a Section and a Sect. And there may be sections, and yet not sects, other and otherwise than merely local or geographical. Whatever I may be as part, and in whatever distinction from other parts of the Church, the vital and essential point is that I must be in The Church, and in the most living relation to it possible for me.

The most needed new, and ever to be renewed, begin-

ning of Christianity—certainly for that section of Christianity of which I am, and for which I am now speaking—is an ever fresh realization and valuation of Christ, not for what He merely means but for what He actually is. The only available and real knowledge of Christ is to know Him in what He always and everywhere is, and not only for what He ever in any time or place was or did. We must know Christ as an Eternal relation, attitude, and disposition to us of God; as an actual, constant operation, process and order of life in us of God; as God's not only expressive but creative and completive Word to us of all that we essentially are and all that we ought to be.

What human word best expresses our own proper and possible relation, our available attitude and status toward that Word of God that Christ is—that at once declaration, commandment, promise and gift of all of Himself in us that we can contain? Is our response to it expressed adequately or possibly in the word "Obedience"? I mean in any sense or fact of present or terrestrial obedience to which we give the name of "Righteousness". Is not true Christianity a perpetual and ever-deepening sense and consciousness of unrighteousness? It does indeed express and demand obedience, righteousness; but if that were all, it would only demand an eternal and infinite impossibility. It would bring to us only condemnation and death, never justification and life. But no,—Christianity is not the demand upon us for righteousness; it is infinitely and eternally more than that. It is the demand upon us—because it is also the promise and gift to us—of God our Righteousness. God-in-us is no mere act of obedience on our part; righteousness is no natural or moral or human endowment. It is the fruit of a personal and spiritual union with God; it is an incarnation of God and a regeneration and resurrection of man. Consequently our proper and possible status and relation to Christ is not obedience, but the infinitely more

potent and available one of Faith. Obedience is limited to what we are or can be, faith unites and allies us with the omnipotence of God. A true obedience or will to obey only more and more discovers its impotence as it the more realizes the endless and limitless demand upon it. A true faith can say and will say, "I can bear all things, do all things, be all things, through Him that helpeth me."—But it has to be a very true faith: a faith that at-one-s itself in truth with God in Christ.

There is every reason in the world why the righteousness of faith—both in *esse* and in *posse*—is immeasurably superior to that of obedience,—besides the quite sufficient one that only in faith alone, and in hope and love which are the substance and form of faith, is obedience even thinkably possible. But I will give just one additional reason. The end of Christ as God-in-Man is human perfection and blessedness,—it is *our* perfection and blessedness, *i.e.* our holiness, righteousness, and eternal life. But while all these are ours, and are nothing to us except as actually also ours, they are given to us, they are made the supreme object of our faith, hope, and love, of our deathless desire, pursuit, and progressive attainment—not *as* ours, but as always without, beyond, and above us. Instead of centering us in ourselves, in *us* and *ours*, they are for ever leading us out of ourselves to seek and find ourselves in Other and others. The selfhood we want, the personal perfection and blessedness we love and seek we know in ourselves only in the want of them; we have them only in Christ in whom God has given them to us—not as possible objects of *our* attainment, but as certain results of Christ in us through the one effective means and method of our faith, and hope, and love in and of Him. What one knows, loves, desires and wills—that one most certainly and effectually does and is. That perfect faith in Christ, which includes all these, will not only now make us Christ's, but will in the end make us Christ, in all that

fulness of Christ which is His Body and Himself, which is His Church and includes us.

I will not now undertake to define The Church further than as our Lord Himself defines it, or as Christianity from the beginning has received and taken it—as the Body and Fulness of Himself. Our relation, both as to its what and its how, its matter and its means, to the living and life-giving Body of Christ, He Himself has expressed and appointed in the two sacraments of His Life,—the sacrament of birth into Him, and the sacrament of continuous life in and through Him; Baptism and the Lord's Supper. It seems to me that, for not merely the meaning but for the reality and the actuality of our Christianity, everything both rests upon and turns upon our understanding and our practical use of these two sacraments. Some will say, "Yes, so far as they go." Others, and very many of us, need to go much further than we do in our understanding and living up to them. One side thinks that the other makes excessive and superstitious use of them; the other thinks that the one has lost all virtue and reality out of them. The point upon which all may stand together as a mean between all possible excess or defect I shall endeavour to determine as follows:

Christianity does not only humanly mean something,—it divinely is something. It is in itself infinitely and eternally more than at present it can mean for us. Whatever of true it may mean to us, it *is* all that, and as much more as it will take an eternity fully to realize. Christ is indeed an Ideal, but the whole value and religion of Him as such is that He is All the Actual of that Ideal. A Word of God not only means, but Is. What is needed to make Christ to us Everything of God and ourselves, is faith enough to know Him as such. He can be to us only so much as we can know Him. The function of faith is to see God in all that He is, and to hear Him in all that He says. If Christ is the Word of God to us, then is

He God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God to us. So again, if true sacraments are words of Christ, words of God, to us—then *are* they what they say to us. They only *are not* so to so many, or to any at all, because *we* do not see them, or hear them, or take them so. The sacrament actually *is* to every one all it means—not merely what *he* means by it but what God means by it—Who takes it so. It is not that our faith puts all its reality into the sacrament *in itself*, but only that our lack of faith takes all realization or actualization of the sacrament *out of us*. We either receive God in Christ or else reject and deny Him in every sacramental act. He is always there in all the significance of the act to be either taken or refused.

I can easily sympathize with the Quaker who prefers to take his religion in inward experiences rather than in external acts which, while such awful realities with God, are so often such lifeless forms with us. But soon the Quaker in his silent and invisible acts of religion must think and feel in terms of the Sacraments of Life. He must realize, or make real to and in himself, the gracious Act of God in both bringing and receiving him into Christ; and no less the continuous grace which through that union, sustained and fed by Communion, imparts to him as his daily bread the eternal life of Christ. The question for the Quaker (apart from the fact that Christ Himself instituted and ordained relation with Himself in and through sacraments) is whether independence of outward expression or form ensures, or is the true and best way to, inward spirituality. In fact there is for us no such thing as independence of form; there are mental and even spiritual, as well as material, forms; which are quite as liable to lapse into formality. The very silence and invisibility of the Quaker's spiritual acts are themselves only other forms which mean and express the same thing. All human life consists in putting into the manifold necessary forms of our existence the substance or

reality which they mean, and so often are not. The whole business and difficulty of life is to realize the things that make life, to enter into the reason, meaning, end and purpose of ourselves and all else, to actualize existence. We will not do this by merely changing one form into another, but only by going through the form or expression given us into the reality or substance of which it is the vehicle and which can be conveyed to us only through *some* form.

So I say with Luther that the beginning and end of our Christianity is to realize or make real our baptism—to *be* what God (not only by His Word which is Christ, but by His individual word to each of us in our baptism) has not only pronounced us but made us—parts and members of Christ. I know too well what it means to say that baptism *only* makes us members of the Church (and with many of us not even that)—by no means always, perhaps never, *really* members of Christ. That comes from dividing the whole truth of baptism into two parts, God's part and our part—God's part of grace or making us, and our part of becoming or being made. Now which of these two parts is the *res* or *thing* in baptism; for both are probably never simultaneously together in the act. What I mean is, that of course God's part is always in the act; but man's part (if that means his subjective or personal appropriation and consciousness of membership in Christ and sonship of God) hardly ever originates in the moment and act of baptism: that takes place either before or after. Upon that point let us pause a moment. To concentrate onesidedly upon man's part in baptism will necessitate the insistence upon only what is called "believer's baptism;" one must bring faith and obedience as the precondition of the reception of whatever of distinctive divine gift is conveyed in the instrument of baptism. The other side takes the position that God's whole part is prior to and unconditioned by man's part in baptism. God gives the whole Christ unconditionally

to every human being: the command to us is to go forth and include all nations, all men, in Christ. There is absolutely no limit or condition to the gift; faith and obedience are the conditions only of our reception of the gift and any consequent profit by it. "God gives us life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life, and he that hath not the Son hath not the life." Now this, "having," not God's giving, is an act of faith and obedience, and so it is conditional upon these. Whether this faith comes before or in or after baptism, it makes good *in us* and *for us* the absolutely unconditional gift to every human being of the life of God in Christ—which baptism in itself *is*, but which it is *in us* only through faith and obedience. And so I repeat that to make good, to realize or make real and actual, our baptism, is the sum and substance of our Christianity.

Now to make good the act and fact of our birth in Christ, we need equally to make good the perpetual fact and continuous act of our life in Him. For life in Christ is never only a fact, it is ever the most strenuous of human acts. To live God in this world is nothing else or less than the life of Christ even as He lived it: "I have overcome the world" is the only full and free and final expression of it. It cannot be anything less than all that baptism says it is, a death to sin and a new and risen life in God. And life cannot be intermitted; it must be lived every day and all the time. Man lives not only by the bread of the body: he needs to labour for that which perishes not, which nourishes unto life eternal. Union is maintained only through communion.

Christianity is expressed in terms which are preserved largely only through inherited reverence and habit. The Cross is still with many both weakness and foolishness; daily dying and living is an absurd extravagance of speech. When Christianity is emptied of its eternal and infinite reality it naturally relapses into what it seemed to Jew and Greek in the beginning. As a require-

ment and obligation upon ourselves for today and tomorrow it is not only an impossibility but an absurdity. It is an actual and a possible truth and reality to us only in faith, hope, and love—only as God's Word says it, promises it, gives it to us in Christ. In no other sense or way could it all become and be ours, as it is, now and here. But it must be ours here and now: only faith in it here can ever make it fact in us hereafter.

Bishop Butler somewhere (not now at hand) shows the analogy between the Christian conception of humanity as One Man under the headship of Christ, and the natural fact of the solidarity of Mankind, of all men as members one of another under the highest ideal unity—which (and not their actual diversity) is the eternally *real*. He proves that the social or other-regarding instincts, impulses, and affections of men are as much a primitive and integral part of their natures as the individual or self-regarding. Christianity in its Love-oneness in Christ (not only all men but all things One in Him) is not the alteration of nature or humanity, but their fulfilment and completion. It is true as far as it goes, that revealed religion is a republication of natural religion; that baptism is a declaration of what we already are,—that is, children of God and members one of another in the Family of God. Only, this great truth of the oneness of Nature and Christ—or of nature and religion—does not and must not deny the necessity and the fact of a new birth or creation, a regeneration and resurrection, from one to the other. Creation is not so much an act as a process: we become more and more not only by the natural growth or our own increase of what we are already, but by the constant addition to us, from without and above, of what we were not in ourselves, of what God Himself is becoming in us and so we in Him. The newborn or twice-born man, the spiritual man, is indeed still his old or natural self, but he is that self *plus* that which he was not before, *plus* what God, through His Word

and by His Spirit (*i.e.* through Christ by the Holy Ghost) is now in him as He never was before. To put on Christ is not a fact of, nor a process of, nature or ourselves; it is a continuous act or process of God in us, which we make our own only through faith. The new birth or the new life is indeed ours too, our own act and our own work,—but it is ours only as it is not *only* ours, but God's in us. It is only the faith that takes life as God's work in us—that can convert it into, and enable, the obedience or righteousness which makes it our work in God. Jesus Christ is God "to usward"—in all the fulness of that relation—as Purpose, Promise and Fulfilment, as Alpha and Omega of ourselves. Faith, Hope, and Love in Christ as "God to us," if given free scope as the divine and only Way, will work out in response all the fulness of "Us to God." God's holiness, righteousness, life—made thus ours in faith, will (thus too) best and most surely make themselves ours in fact.

Thus the spiritual, the Christ, in us is all the natural,—just as the man of maturest reason is all that the unconscious and insensible foetus was in the womb: he is its reason, meaning, end and purpose. But the spiritual or Christ in us, while in a sense in us from the beginning—that is to say while potential even in our natural selves or our nature—is far more in its actuality than our natural selves or our nature: as much more as Christ Himself, while all of man, was also more than man, was God-Man. This truth to be seen in its Wholeness (and its truth is only in its Wholeness) must be looked at completely on both sides. Christ is as truly God as man, and as truly man as God: just as man is as truly son of God as he is product of Nature, and as truly product of Nature as he is son of God. He has to realize Himself (whether we mean Christ or Man) in both sides or stages of His (or his) being: to do either is to do, or is only through doing, the other. God-Manhood is already a reality in Christ, and has got to be an actuality in us and in the

world—if it takes eternity and all of God to make it. But in the meantime, whether possible or not (or *when* only possible), for the individual man or for humanity there is none other goal, there is no other end either natural or spiritual, than God-Manhood. It must be a Faith, a Hope, a Love to us, and no *mere* ideal but an Actual, though it be as high as God and as distant as Eternity. There is no limit to Truth, Beauty, or Goodness and Good, to Holiness, Righteousness, or Life; and since these are our nature, as well as our Super-nature or destinature—there can and must be no limit to Faith, Hope, and Love. I have implied that Christ is the end or goal not only of the individual soul, in whatever Heaven is (in fact heaven needs no other definition than simply "To be where and what Christ is"),—but also of Humanity where it is, here on earth. Our Lord Himself teaches us to pray not that we may be in heaven, but that heaven may come and be on earth: the Kingdom of Heaven is within us. That we shall make a heaven of earth is a vastly other and harder task than that we shall be taken out of this world of pain and impossibilities into a heaven of pure and endless ease. Our Lord at the threshold of His ministry—that ministry which was primarily the solving for us in His own Person the problem and process of eternal life (or of God-Manhood)—was met by the doubt (because the human impossibility) expressed in the words: "If thou be the son of God, command these stones that they be made bread." He knew that He was undertaking the impossible; and His victory over the natural fear or doubt found one expression out of many in the utterance several years after,"God is able out of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Abraham is the great exemplar of that human faith which at-ones itself with God who "quickens the dead and calls things that are not as though they were." Such a faith will not stagger at the Word that even "the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord." I who

can see God in me, who can foresee all myself in God—why shall I hesitate to look further and farther, and see not only God in the world but all the world in God? Is God farther relatively from being in humanity, in society, in business, in politics, in war, in not only the Church but the State, and in even international relations,—than in us who yet can believe that He *is* in us and can hope that we shall be as wholly in Him? And are not that faith and hope, however far off, ground enough and cause enough to justify all possible love, service, and sacrifice that we can expend upon it? Especially when we know that, whether or no justified by infinite and eternal fact and reality, just that love, service, and sacrifice thus expended, and in proportion to the expenditure, as a matter of fact constitutes all the greatness, glory, and blessedness of even our present and temporal being.

I can see the whole field of compromises that might be necessary, and even right for the time, in the endless process of the transition of the natural into the spiritual, from the human into the divine, from the creature to God. For example I can conceive how despotism, how slavery, how a thousand violences, such as not only wars but massacres and exterminations, persecutions, etc., can have seemed to have been more than merely permitted by God and so to have had the positive sanction and even command of religion. I can myself recall a time and conditions under which duelling, lynch-law, and similar practices, could naturally seem more than necessities, even reasonable and right, in the face and in lieu of worse and greater and no otherwise to be dealt with evils. There might be some things, purely natural and even anti-spiritual, which can be displaced and replaced only by purely spiritual substitutes,—and therefore can be abolished only when adequate spiritual principles and motives exist and proper spiritual conditions permit. I might recount an instance, in the (forever) past, where nothing could—there *was* nothing that could—absolve or excuse a man from fighting

a duel, but the actually higher reason and motive of a genuinely Christian courage and manhood. When this arrives, despotism, slavery, violences, irrationalities, and inequities of all sorts, that were inevitable until there were higher reasons, and motives, and forces to replace and abolish them, become, or at least can be seen, felt, known, acknowledged and abandoned as sins. So, in Christianity we have to be redeemed not merely from evils, but from the *mere* nature and natural, and from the mere human selfhood, in which such evils are both inevitable and incurable.

To come back to the very superficial question and answer with which this paper began,—Nothing less than all the truth and reality of What the Church is will answer all the question of Why it is necessary in Christianity. Even treating the Church, as is done in that purely popular form, as only a way or means of "getting there,"—as the ships are certainly only a conveyance to the other and complete end and fact of Europe itself,—in us and in our world the matter of means is not a negligible one: we do not attain ends without the use of means. And the Church as the Sacrament of Christ stands in the Origins of Christianity very much on the same level as Christ Himself as the Sacrament of God. But the sacrament is not a sacrament indeed—is not a truly divine sign, a word, or The Word, of God,—unless it is more than a sign; unless it is The Thing signified. Christ is not an outward and visible sign—*minus* the inward and spiritual grace (the gift and fact and reality) of God Himself with us and in us. And as God is in Christ as the Sacrament of Himself and His Life,—just so is Christ in His Church which is His Body, and the Fulness of Himself in our humanity and in ourselves.

Christ, the Church, the Sacraments,—all represent (and are) what Baron von Hügel so aptly calls the *Givenness* in Christianity: that is, not what we must be in ourselves in order to have, but what we must have in and of God

in order to be. One is not in any sense, either of birth or adoption, the son of another by first himself being it and then being received and treated as such. On the contrary, only by having become sons or been made sons by The Other, prior to ourselves and from without ourselves, by nature or by grace or by both,—can we either know or call ourselves sons, or begin to realize in ourselves the meaning and reality of sonship. Because we are sons of God—by creation and by incarnation, by nature and by grace, by double birth of Him, in Adam and in Christ, —God sends forth into our hearts the Spirit of His Son, or of sonship indeed, whereby we cry "Abba, Father." We do not become, or are not made, sons through having the spirit, we have the spirit through having been made, and (by act of God) *being*, sons. Our part is not to become, but to realize that we, through grace and act of God in Christ, *are* sons of God. In a word, Christianity is:— to realize or to make real (not in themselves but only in ourselves) the truths and facts of God in Christ, of Christ in His Church or Body, of the Church, in all its fulness of the life of Christ and of God, in humanity and in us. Faith is the doing this; and where Faith is, and in proportion as it is real, will ensue Holiness, Righteousness, and Eternal Life, which are the elements and process of our conversion into the Life and Likeness of God.

I have described only what the Church is, so far as it is embodied in the two universally accepted sacraments of Spiritual Birth and Life in Christ. This is not to exclude or ignore whatever more, of organization, of order, of practice, or of worship or devotion, may be necessary to secure and preserve the primal and vital essentials—of Unity, Holiness, Universality, and Continuity. These latter are the Church, are Christ and Christianity. All else are only means or modes or conditions of these. About those means or modes or manners are practically all our difficulties and differences within what we are not hopelessly disagreed in our willingness

to call The Church. Unless our variant principles and conscientious insistences are, in the sight of God, honestly and sincerely subordinated to the Things that we agree in knowing are Christianity—namely, Oneness with God in Christ, and Oneness with Humanity in Christ—they are Sin.

National Contributions to Christianity

By C. S. W. Horsefield, B.A. (Cambridge).[1]

It will perhaps be unnecessary to feel any anxiety lest the title of this paper should have led any to anticipate a complete analysis of Christianity, after the style of a certain modern school, in process of which our faith is shown to be a compound of heterogeneous elements, drawn from various sources, which are skilfully separated off one by one and allocated to their respective origins—Hellenic, Mithraic, Egyptian, etc.—until we are left with the little nucleus of ethnic animism round which it all grew up. Neither is there much need to disown the opposite point of view, which refuses to recognize any beneficial contribution to Christianity on the part of other nations; whose motto appears to be, in the words of Laocoon, "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*," and which regards with suspicion any suggestion of Greek influence upon Christian faith. But it is not improbable that this hardly accurate title, chosen rather for the sake of brevity, would seem to imply the view of some at least

[1]Mr. C. S. W. Horsefield, son of the Rev. F. J. Horsefield, vicar of St. Silas, Bristol, came into residence at Cambridge in October, 1910, with a scholarship at Pembroke College. In June, 1913, he graduated B.A., with first class honours in the Classical Tripos. He proceeded to read for Part II of the Theological Tripos, specializing in Dogmatics, but a career, full of promise in every respect, was cut short by an illness which developed fatally in February, 1914. Mr. Horsefield was a keen supporter of the Student Movement, especially interested in missions, and it had been his hope to take Holy Orders in the Church of England. This paper was read at a meeting of the Pembroke College Theological Society in November, 1913.

of the *soi-disant* "modern Churchmen," who recognize the centrality of the divine revelation of Jesus Christ, but regard it as having been supplemented with elements contributed by these other religions, which were indeed foreign to the original spirit of Christianity, but have been, in Prof. Gardner's phrase, "baptized into Christ," and become an integral part of the faith and practice of His Church. To this view there are many objections, not least among which is the practically inevitable danger of reading into other faiths Christian theological ideas to which they were in reality total strangers, and then triumphantly pointing out the ethnic source from which these doctrines were obviously derived. The true Christian standpoint is surely that which recognizes the complete and absolute finality of the revelation of God to man in the Person of Jesus Christ, the only true centre of those spiritual experiences of which Christian doctrines are the expression in the intellectual sphere, Christian ethics in the domain of practical life. To speak then of subsequent contributions to this is really anomalous; for Christianity, so regarded, is Christ. But the realization of the full significance of this revelation was not an immediate consequence of it, but a gradual process to which each nation that is brought to faith in Him has its characteristic contribution to make, its fresh light to shed upon one side or the other, the practical or the theoretical. It will be noted, as we consider in the briefest outline a few of the more important of these contributions, that the national characteristics conditioning the respective interpretations of Christianity by the various peoples are such as have previously been apparent in their earlier beliefs; a fact which affords a good illustration of the truth of Dr. Illingworth's remark that "Christianity fulfils all that is true in previous religions", for it reveals the God for which all others are seeking.

The most prominent aspect of the Greek mind was its insatiable thirst for knowledge for its own sake. In the

sphere of philosophy and religion, this spirit showed itself in the keenest speculation over the whole realm of metaphysics, and by fearless theorizing about the very nature of the gods themselves which contrasted most sharply with the love of mystery that characterized the contemporary religious thought of Egypt and the East. It was this spirit of enquiry that gave to Europe the impulse of progress, and it was therefore to be expected that Greece would have a large contribution to make, on the theoretic side, to the interpretation of the Christian message. And so it was; the Greek spirit added intellectual conviction to the truths already received as spiritual revelation; it found a reasoned basis for conduct, a firm and rational foundation without which the Christian ethical system could never have endured—for as long as there is a radical difference between truth and falsehood, so long will the fundamental importance of right belief for right life remain—and it gave to Christian thought its first beginnings of definite form. To the minds trained in the schools of Hellenic philosophy we owe the commencement of the working out of the basic conceptions of God, and of the Person of Christ, the doctrines of the Trinity and of the two natures of our Lord; and especially that most characteristic Greek idea, so liable to misconception by subsequent thinkers, the doctrine of the Logos, the eternal Word of God. Such were the new things which the Greek mind brought out of its treasure for the benefit of the Christian Church; but before leaving this topic it would surely be right to see, in the sublime promises of the life to come which Greek thought upon the subject embodied in the mysteries, the influence which led Hellenic teachers like Origen to a true interpretation of Christian teaching as to the future state of men, in correction of the grossly materialistic view of millennial blessings which characterized the conceptions of not a few of the early leaders of the Church.

Such are some of the factors of her debt to Greece: what had the other great European nation of the age to offer? The pre-eminent feature of the Roman genius was undoubtedly its capacity for organization, government and legislation; a feature which dominates the whole course of the history of her rise to power, and manifests itself not least plainly in her religion, which had been so firmly organized, and was governed by such stable laws that, long after belief in the old gods of the Republic had perished amongst almost all of the upper classes, the fixed system of ritual still continued to be observed, and its offices of *flamen* and *pontifex* were still accounted honours worthy of the ambition of the greatest and noblest in the land. So when the Roman spirit came into closest contact with Christianity, it naturally regarded it in a legal and political light. From the conception of God as the supreme Ruler they passed to consider His relations to His subjects, and the laws by which He governs them; and so it comes to pass that to Rome we owe the first powerful impulse towards the interpretation of the Christian doctrine of sin. The value of this contribution is in no way impaired by the fact of the resultant tendency to extreme legalism, and to perhaps unjustifiable doctrines of "merit"; for they are by no means the inevitable consequence of it. The second great contribution of this Roman genius to Christianity was their emphasis on the conception of the Catholic Church as a mighty force, a compact unity, a complete organization parallel to that of the State; and to the influence of this idea, adopted and worked out by the early generations of Christians, is largely to be attributed the power and vitality which enabled the Church to withstand all the storms of persecution from without, and the subtle undermining work of heresies from within, and to survive even the ruin of the mighty fabric of Empire.

Widely different in kind, yet perhaps not less im-

portant, was the contribution of the Teutonic peoples to the full development of the Catholic faith. As these races are reflected for us in the pages of Tacitus, we note three main characteristics: simple faith, love of personal freedom, and strength of family relationships; and we may perhaps feel disposed to regard these as more or less permanent features of the race: certainly it was not until the Reformation period that the importance of their contribution was realized by the Church. This love of individual liberty led them to lay most stress upon the personal relation of each man to his God: as the paramount interest of the Greek was theological, and of the Roman anthropological, so the Teuton turned his attention to soteriology, and emphasized the fact of personal redemption, and the importance of individual faith. The great significance of this contribution can hardly be over-estimated; and with it went his idea of God not as a Being of an order infinitely remote from man, to be known only through metaphysical speculation; not as the righteous Monarch of the world, revealing Himself through the laws He has promulgated; but as the Father Whose care extends to each individual member of His family, and to return Whose love is the true aim of the life of every man.

Thus through all the centuries the progressive assimilation of all that each people has to contribute to our full comprehension of the Christian revelation has been proceeding; and we may admit that the average Christian of today has a more complete knowledge of that wherein his faith consists than his predecessor in any other age. We shall therefore expect to find the Church in possession of a fuller life, a more abounding energy, a firmer grasp of the deep sources of strength, than ever before; as she has spread abroad her roots through these various nations, and drawn from each the fresh life-giving powers they had to impart, her branches will be stronger and firmer, and her fruit more abundant. But as we face

the facts, we note not one and another merely, but many disquieting signs, which rouse within us an uneasy consciousness that all is not so well; that the Church is not gaining a wider hold upon the masses of the people; that her grasp is rather failing, and her grip loosening. Every expedient to remedy this state of things is tried, but with little, if any, apparent result; surely because they do not go deep enough to touch the real source of the trouble. May it not be that the Church is suffering today from arrested growth, and from the loss of vitality which is its inevitable result? Progress, as Dr. Jevons reminds us, is a law of life in religion as in other spheres; Christianity must not stand, or it is in imminent danger of falling. Neither will it progress of its own accord, for religion is nothing but man's search after God; and if it be subject to the law of evolution, that does not necessarily involve progress. Are there not some national contributions still lacking, some sources of power never yet tapped by the Christian Church, for want of which she languishes today? We live in the age of internationalism; it is impossible for any portion of the world to sever itself from the rest, and not be the weaker; conversely, the influence of each upon all may be greater than ever before. There are, of a surety there are, treasures of national characteristics and capabilities which the Church has never roused herself to claim, and yet without which she can never gain her fullest triumph. Few today would venture to echo Prof. Cairns' statement of but a few years ago that by the fall of Paganism before Christianity in the fifth century of our era "there was ended a revolution greater than if the religions of India, China and Japan were one and all to fall: for these are not the leading nations of the world, nor will their thought affect all time"; we are beginning to realize the fallacy of such prophecies, and to understand that just as of old Christianity triumphed by absorbing all that was beneficial to her from the re-

ligious life of other nations, so, and only so, she must do once again today. On our acceptance of and action upon that principle depends the very life of Christendom: let us therefore briefly consider what is the "peculiar honour" which each nation has yet to bring to our King, and what gaps in our conceptions of Christianity these will be calculated to fill.

Of the nature of the contribution which a Christian Africa has to make we have already some considerable amount of evidence; for in Uganda we have a typical Bantu country at least nominally Christian. Their previous religion was the simple animism which is still, in variously modified forms, that of their neighbours; containing a vague belief in a remote supreme Being, and a very lively dread of hosts of lesser spiritual existences, compassing every department of life, and requiring to be constantly propitiated with the due observance of prescribed rites, if the worshipper would avoid incurring the dreadful calamities involved by their wrath. As soon therefore as such minds grasp the Christian verities of the unity and love of God, these previous religious conceptions are, in a manner, brought to bear upon the new faith. The Muganda Christian has an intense realization of the personality and of the omnipotence of God, and a vivid sense of His love and care for His people in all the affairs of life, in small matters as well as in great; and his prayer and worship are to him perfectly natural and real communion with his Maker. Hence arises an absolutely implicit trust in His wisdom, giving on the one hand freedom from the cares and anxieties of life, not merely in the moral sphere, but in all the regions of private and of public life; and on the other a complete readiness to carry out whatever he conceives to be the commands of his Lord. Examples of this could be multiplied, did space permit, but are perhaps unnecessary; the attendant danger of religious fanaticism is of course obvious, and is instanced by its actual oc-

currence in the case of the Mohammedan tribes of North Africa and of Arabia, descended, as anthropologists tell us, from a common ancestry with these Bantu tribes, the ancient Gallas. A well-balanced presentation, however, of the whole Christian message can keep this in check; and does not Christendom today stand in need of a fresh emphasis upon this side of our faith? This was the view of His relation to God which underlies the whole life and teaching of Jesus Christ; can it be said to be in a like measure at the root of our conventional modern Christianity? We are inclined to let the eighteenth-century conception of Nature as a vast objective mechanism, controlled by unalterable laws, or with its workings disturbed at most on the rarest occasions, intervene as a great unbroken system, rigid and opaque, between man and God, so that it dulls the edge of faith, and deadens the fervour of prayer. Present-day Christianity surely needs, as Ritschl saw, to refuse to be hurried into a premature synthesis of the religious and scientific views of the world; and it requires to recognize that its own conception of the omnipotence and availability of the power of God contains such grave inadequacies as seriously restrict and cripple its effectiveness as a working force in the world.

One of the most prominent features of the Chinese character is its firmness and dogged perseverance. This trait is familiar to all those who come into contact with the Chinese in commercial relations; and it is writ large in the pages of history that tell of the permanence and solidity of that great Empire, and of the persistence, beside the philosophical systems of Confucius and of Lao-tse, of remnants of the ancient animistic religion. It is this same characteristic which makes the Chinese capable of inflicting or enduring any suffering in what he believes to be the cause of right, and has thus earned for him the reputation—quite undeserved, his friends tell us—of callous cruelty. When therefore he imbibes the

truths of Christianity, not only is he ready to suffer for his faith to the utmost—as was amply proved, for example, in the Boxer troubles,—but he will also carry his principles into all departments of life as his one standard of judgment and of practice. He will, *e.g.*, be unable to understand the action of a country that openly professes Christianity, and stoops to enrich herself by forcing upon a weaker neighbour that which is so wholly detrimental to her welfare as the opium which we still thrust into the reluctant ports of China. And surely this firmness of Christian principle, following the example of Him who steadfastly set His face to go to His death for His religious principles, is a contribution urgently needed by the Christendom, in which even those whose actions are guided by their religious beliefs feel impelled to seek to justify them on purely secular grounds, while in political, in commercial and in social life there is easily tolerated much that is in the sharpest contradiction to the faith that nominally pervades the whole, and that without arousing the least feeling of compunction for the inconsistency. Priceless as this contribution will be to preserve European Christianity from becoming a mere invertebrate pretence and eventually collapsing utterly, it does not exhaust the still hidden treasure that China has in store for the Church. At the back of their religious thought has ever been a fixed belief in the solidarity of the whole nation; the worship of Shang-ti, the supreme deity, is confined to the Emperor alone; but he appears before his shrine as the representative of the whole nation; as summing up, in his own person, the worship of the vast family of which he is the head. And surely this conception, when Christian ideas have broadened it to include the whole race, will bring into clearer emphasis a side of the truth never yet adequately recognized by its disciples; the fact that the Fatherhood of God implies the universal brotherhood of men. It may well be that for China is reserved the honour of leading the van of

Christendom in the solution of those social problems, which only the shameful and unchristian indifference and neglect, shown on the part of a section of modern "Christian" nations towards the temporal and spiritual needs of their fellow-members in the one great family, have so long perpetuated.

The significance of this idea for the great question of Christian unity will have been already perceived. More and more insistently is the fact being borne in upon the Church, that the unhappy divisions which still distract her are as fertile sources of weakness, as heavy shackles upon her effectiveness, as any of those hitherto considered; but the final reconciliation of the opposing factors apparently needs some further stimulus from without in order to produce the still required spirit of courtesy and Christian charity towards those of different shades of opinion, and of readiness to sink personal ideas, however dearly cherished, for the common weal. Surely it is no false hope that looks with confidence for these to the time when Christianity shall have thoroughly permeated the thought of that sturdy people whose religion is practically the apotheosis of this patriotic spirit, and whose social ideal is a courtesy that transcends all our western notions; when Japan shall bring her contribution to lay at the feet of Christ. From the Church of Japan we may also learn that Christian theology cannot afford to leave on one side the questions raised by modern thought and science: they must be faced and answered, if our faith is to remain a living force for our own times. If the eager, enquiring spirit of Japan can show this example to the Christian Church in its older homes, there will be an end to the danger that we incur the judgment pronounced upon those Pharisees of old, who amid the more progressive ideas of modern days built monuments of regretful longing to those very prophets, whom their fathers had slain as dangerous innovations.

How can we attempt, in the space at our disposal, to

lift the veil of time and look in even upon a portion of the unknown wealth of fresh interpretation and new life, lying hid as yet from the Church's view, in the religious mind of India, the field by far the richest in spiritual treasure of any that spread before us? It may however be that the examination of but a few fragments, dug out of this mine of wealth, will convey some faint idea of the possibilities of the veins still lying unworked for lack of labourers; at least the task must be essayed. The great ideal then of Indian religious thought is that of renunciation of, or rather redemption from, the world and its defilement; and though the Hindu doctrine of Maya is far from the Christian conception of the world and its relation to man, yet in its practical effect this ideal, which of necessity looms very large in Indian Christian thought, is full of suggestions for the followers of Him Who declared His kingdom to be not of this world. Have we not wandered far from the realization of the dominant truth so plainly felt by His great disciple, that our citizenship is in Heaven? Is it not true that our religious ideas have become deeply tinged with the materialism of the last century in the West? Do we not need to be reminded of our duty of detachment from the world, as a corrective to our still-prevailing tendency to judge, *e.g.*, the success of a career by a monetary standard — that lowest of all forms of materialistic thought; and of our duty of self-denial and of simplicity of life, in face of the enervating luxury and self-indulgence which is sapping the strength of modern civilization, just as it has proved the bane of more than one powerful Empire of the past? These are plain truths, one might say commonplaces, of Christianity, but yet how little do we realize them, or shall until the higher spirituality of a Christian India shames us into their acceptance?

In the second place, India will surely have much to teach us as to the place of the Divine Spirit in the life of man; for it is through spiritual union with God that

this redemption, according to Hindu thought, is to be sought. Here again there is of course the widest divergence between the meaning which these words convey to Hindu ears and that which they contain for us; the one conception is founded on pantheism, with its doctrine of Moksha, or the practice of Shakti, the other on the historic personality of our Redeemer. In spite of this difference, we may recognize in the Indian ideal points of truth contained also in our faith, but which we have never yet fully emphasized. Does our conception of spirituality assign to mysticism that share in Christian thought which the Indian does, and which we see it take in the writings of the New Testament? While we urge the connection, sometimes forgotten by Hindu minds, between spirituality and morals, do we not ourselves tend to forget, as Mr. Andrews suggests, the importance of the "calm and quiet spaces" in the would-be spiritual life? From these causes the Church's ideal of spirituality, and consequently her level of attainment in spiritual power, has been lowered; we need again the East to remind us that there can be no conception of this union with the divine too close for the religious life to reach, and therefore there are no depths of the divine omnipotence upon which the Christian may not draw for deliverance from evil and power for good in his own life, and the Church for the fulfilment of her world-wide mission.

If the Church as a whole be brought to the comprehension of the meaning of this truth which she has always held implicitly, yet without realizing its significance, India will have made a contribution to her faith which of itself is almost sufficient to meet all her needs; yet mention must be made in passing of at least two other points of Christian truth on which we may expect her to throw new light. First as to the true ideal of Christian character: to a British mind it is characterized by courage, truth, justice, uprightness and honour; in India the

most prominent characteristics are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness. We need to learn how one-sided and defective, judged by New Testament standards, is our present conception. And lastly the appeal made by the communal ideal, and the strong hold it has upon an Indian mind, suggests that when that mind learns of Christ, we shall learn, in correction of our excessive Western individualism, something of the power of communal worship and work.

Such are some of the unappropriated treasures of thought and life which still await the rightful claim of the Church, if as we believe it is only in her hands that they can be used to the utmost for the benefit not only of individual peoples, but of all mankind. Two obvious dangers that must meet her on the threshold of this undertaking, and the precautions necessary against them, must be briefly indicated. The first is the grave hazard that together with these contributions there may be brought into the Church, as when first she received the gifts of Greek and Roman, alien elements which may poison her life-blood, and once again cost her bitter agony and struggles to expel. She cannot ignore the danger; she dare not let it deter her from the task; but in a strengthened spiritual life, in a fresh and vital experience once more of all that the life of her Lord truly means to her, will be found a sure safeguard against the infection; and this is clearly one at least of our paramount needs today. The second danger, yet more formidable in its menace, is the peril of a lost opportunity, meaning for the Church forfeiture of those new possibilities of life which would save her from sinking into the ignoble decrepitude towards which she seems, in the view of some, to be rapidly falling; and for the rest of the world, deprivation of that Catholic truth which they have equal right to hear; and involving maybe a repetition of the Mohammedan reproach, and the rise of new anti-christian powers that will for ever make

our task infinitely more difficult. This crisis is upon her now, and now it must be faced, for in a few decades at most it must be too late; and surely it can only, humanly speaking, be dealt with by the rising up of those who are ready to take up in this work the responsibility of the Christian profession, and to fill up that which is still lacking of the sufferings of Christ, for His body's sake, which is the Church.

The Church stands today, like the king of Babylon in Ezekiel's prophecy of old, at the parting of the way; but small need has she to use divination, to shake the arrows to and fro, to consult the teraphim, to look for omens. The path of duty is plain before her; though the heights of the possibilities of one road, and the depth of the catastrophe that lies at the end of the other, none can as yet foresee. "When there is no vision, the people languisheth"; and in such a crisis there is need once again to seek the Christian vision of a world's need, of the power of God to supply that need, of the parting commission of her Lord that bids His followers, "Give ye them to eat," and of the great reward in new fulness of life that awaits her full obedience. That the whole glory of this recompense has been either adequately or accurately sketched in this brief paper, of the defects of which none is more painfully aware than the writer, is impossible, but at least its main purpose has been fulfilled, if it has served to make more real to any the vision which is such an inspiration to him, as to many another: the prospect of a Christian revelation known and realized in all its glorious fulness; of an all-embracing body that may show some real right to the noble title of the Holy Catholic Church; of a time when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, and we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

On the Character of the Swedish Church

By Nathan Söderblom, D.D.,
Archbishop of Upsala.[1]

An ordination of priests is being held in a Swedish cathedral. The procession advances from the vestry towards the altar. First come the candidates, literally, according to their title, "white-robed", but not in the *vestis candida*, which was in old days called by the Swedish name of "*röklin*" and which was expressly required as lately as in the Church Law of 1571; in the Articles of Visitation by Andreas Laurentii Björnram in 1585—"they shall also use *röklins* for all the duties but their office"; and later, in the wide-flowing surplice (*mäss-skjorta, alba linea*), earlier called a "smock" (*mässasärk*) in Swedish; and in the Liturgy of John, the celebrated Red Book, *Liturgia suecanae ecclesiae catholicae et orthodoxae conformis* (the Liturgy agreeable to the Swedish Catholic and Orthodox Church), 1576, thus translated, "O Lord God, make me white and my heart pure, that cleansed in the blood of the Lamb I may enjoy eternal bliss." The surplice is bound round the waist by a girdle (*linda, cingulum, zona*). After the candidates to be ordained follow the assistants, consisting of the dean, the members of the chapter (the successors of the canons and *domherr* of old), and some few priests from the diocesan city or its neighbourhood,

[1]This article and another to follow had been entirely written and sent away for translation before the election of the writer to the See of Upsala.

e.g. someone who stands in close personal relationship to some of the candidates. They wear over their surplices chasubles (*casula*, *mässhakar*, formerly termed *mässuhakel*), mostly of red and gold, or black and silver. Last comes the bishop in his cope and mitre (previously called *kloffhatt*, cloven hat), and carrying his pastoral staff or crozier. If the ceremony is in Upsala Cathedral, the Archbishop wears a heavy cope, all of gold, the gift of Gustavus III, who was fond of splendour. Less ostentatious but more venerable garments are preserved in the wardrobes of the cathedral. The crozier has been set with ornaments at various times but the stem is more ancient. The Archbishop's crozier has not only been borne in the past century by Reuterdahl, the eminent theologian and historian of the Swedish Church (d. 1870), and its leading hymn-writer, Wallin (d. 1839); but also in the 18th century by Erik Benzelius, junior (d. 1743), the man of deeply scientific erudition and of clear-sighted faith, and in "the era of political greatness" by Haquin Spegel (d. 1714), great alike as a hymn composer and a champion of austere piety in the Caroline times; by Laurentius Paulinus Gothus (d. 1646), who took a dignified share in the gigantic task of national education during what was probably the proudest time of our Church; and by Olaus Martini (d. 1609), noble character that he was, during the troublous discord with the saviour of the realm, Karl IX. But for forty-two years before that it was borne by the first evangelical Archbishop of Sweden, Laurentius Petri (d. 1573), who, in close union of unreserved evangelical liberty with due allowance for the venerable forms of institutional religion and with enthusiasm for the independence of the Church guaranteed by the episcopal constitution, personifies that ideal which destiny appointed for the Swedish Church. The same staff was earlier carried by the founder of Upsala University, Jacob Ulfson, who died at the age of one hundred, in 1521; by the powerful

mediaeval prelate, Jöns Bengston (d. 1467); by his more spiritual predecessor, Nils Ragvaldson, a worthy representative of Sweden and the defender of Engelbrekt at the Synod of Basle (d. 1448), and by others before them. According to Dean Lundström's expressed dictum there is no reason for doubting the tradition that as early as the twelfth century Stefan, the first Archbishop of Upsala, bequeathed this crozier to his successors.

While the episcopal staff has thus called up to our memory the living shapes of bygone days, the procession has reached the altar. After an exhortation, scripture, prayer, and the recitation of the creed, the actual ordination follows. Slowly conducted by the organ, the choir raises the ancient Whitsuntide hymn which is derived from Rome in the eleventh century, "Come, Holy Ghost" (*Veni Sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda fidelium*), the only hymn that retains its Latin original, in the edition of 1819, alongside of the translation by Laurentius Petri and Erik Gustaf Geijer. During this hymn the ordinands are robed in chasubles. Then the officiating bishop and his assistants lay their hands on the heads of the candidates, for each of whom the bishop offers a separate Lord's Prayer, after which there follow, from the altar, intercession, admonition, and blessing.

We cannot be surprised if various emotions are awakened by the high colour and solemnity of the procession and such ceremonials. If the spectator is an Anglican of the present day and of the modern High Church type, or a Roman Catholic, he will rejoice; if he is a Protestant of the severer school, he will confirm the cross-grained and cutting observation made by the honoured and sterling Bulstrode Whitelocke, the emissary of Cromwell, who wrote at Gothenburg, in November, 1653, "They have pictures and images and great observation of ceremonies in their churches", or he will be filled with indignation at this scene. It is not implied that

the conclusions of the one or the other are entirely correct. Perhaps both their gladness and indignation will be modified if the persons concerned pursue the closer considerations which we shall now undertake.

In the case of a living being we distinguish between soul and body. Doubt may be entertained as to how far downwards the soul may be traced in the realm of inanimate and animate creation. Where does the inspiring influence of the spirit end? Where does "lifeless" matter step in? Is any matter really dead? Is it not sooner or later taken again into requisition for spiritual purposes? The model and material from which life has fled may once more become a channel for the soul, even as an old and rusted bugle which one may take down from the wall, for music; if a man knows the art, he may win from it tones that a hundred years back carried a meaning from man to man, though it has since been mute. The downward limits of organic matter, the body, are not defined. According to its intensity, a spirit shapes for itself, out of created things and events, an organ and an impress far beyond the organism which is wont to be called its body. And it is not seldom impossible to fix the limits of the body upwards. Where is the dividing line between the soul and that which it inspires? Yet we make a distinction between the thing formed and the spirit which dwells in it. So also in the living organism that is composed of the religious community, the Church, a manifest distinction is found between the body and the soul; the former consists of fixed shapes, which are at an early age set forth in ceremonies and organization, and, at a later phase, in formulated dogmas and creeds: and the soul consists of emotions, thoughts, faith, personal and collective experiences, that are more or less able to shape a body for themselves or to use for their organ a model already at hand,—or else they live, thronged and obstructed in a trying confinement which nevertheless has an element of test and discipline.

THE SWEDISH CHURCH

I

A feature peculiar to the Swedish Church is the durability and adaptation throughout the ages of its "body", of its shaped organism.

(1) When the good news of the Kingdom of God and of Christ, and of the unity of faithful brethren in the Spirit was gradually organized into a religion, the Church acquired fixity and universality by means of the episcopate. In its turn, Sweden, too, by the same means, was included in the Catholic Church. Beginning from itinerant missionary bishops, such as Gauzbert, who was consecrated about 831 by Ebo of Rheims, development advanced, when once Christianity obtained firmer and firmer foothold, to the formation of dioceses and the unbroken succession of bishops. But the occupants of sees were for a long time foreigners, Englishmen, Germans, and perhaps one Frenchman. It was only in the twelfth century that Skara seems to have possessed native bishops. The organized connection with Christendom was first made at Hamburg, on the throne of Archbishop Ansgar, soon united with Bremen, and transferred thither. In 1104, Scandinavia obtained an archbishop's throne in Lund, which then belonged to Denmark, and, with the exception of a rather short spell under Magnus Eriksson in the fourteenth century, was only permanently united with Sweden in 1658, after the Reformation had swept away the archiepiscopal dignity of the office. Archbishop Eskil of Lund, at the instance of and in the presence of Pope Alexander II, consecrated Stefan, a monk of Alfvastra, probably of foreign origin, to be the first Archbishop of Upsala, which already possessed its bishop. At that time the papal bull converting Sweden into an archiepiscopal province under Upsala expressly mentioned four other dioceses: Skara, Linköping, Strängnäs, and Västerås. The consecration took place at Sens, in

August, 1164, three-quarters of a millennium ago.[2] It was to this noted metropolitan church that Alexander III had resorted to evade Frederick Barbarossa, who later was obliged to acknowledge him as master of the situation. Alexander stayed at Sens a year and a half. His ceremonious reception took place on September 30, 1163. Another fugitive prelate, Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, visited the Pope there at the end of 1164, and later passed the four years from 1166 in the monastery of St. Columba at Sens.

Stefan's consecration was an opening in papal policy which aimed at partitioning the great provinces of the Church, and so to prohibit centres of churchly authority too powerful for Rome, clip the very comprehensive schemes of high prelates, and bind their suffragans more directly and intimately with Rome. In pursuance of this policy the Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, in the capacity of papal legate, had consecrated in Trondhjem an Archbishop for Norway, and conducted the first Synod of Sweden at Linköping in 1152. As the certainty of securing the projected archiepiscopate for Sweden was by no means clear, he had left the pallium in the Pope's behalf at Lund with Eskil, who now, twelve years later, in France, laid it on the neck of the first Archbishop of Upsala. Successes in Scandinavia were no slight help in winning for Nicholas the throne of the Pope, which he, the only Englishman who attained that dignity, adorned with honour under the title of Hadrian IV, immediately before Alexander III. In such a sense these events implied a closer inclusion of Sweden in the papal Church. The synod of Linköping had granted Peter's Pence,—an evidence of the same tendency. But the Pope's foreign supremacy over Swedish Christendom could not, either

[2]Compare the writer's article on "The Consecration of the First Archbishop of Upsala in 1164" in *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift*, Upsala (1915).

now or later, permeate so thoroughly as in countries less remote. The King of Östergötland, Sverker, showed co-operation with the legate's demands, but he was not in undivided power over Sweden. In the devastating struggle between the families of Sverker and Erik, which covers more than a century of our history down to 1250, the contest between Pope and Emperor is reflected at a distance. The family of Erik displayed in general the national aspirations. An unceasing indication of this is the fact, which we shall quote now, and which comes between the two occurrences we have mentioned: the visit of the papal legate to Sweden in 1152, and the consecration of our first Archbishop in 1164 in the presence of Alexander III.

In 1160, Sverker's rival, the Swedish King Erik, died, on May 18, at the hands of a Danish prince. He was attending a church festival at Upsala, and the story goes that the King, who would not interrupt the mass for the sake of a hostile attack, died in a battle that was fought when he emerged from the church. This building occupied the site of the present Church of the Holy Trinity. For the love of his people his end was important, for it set the seal of martyrdom on a life sanctified in the establishment of righteousness and peace and devotion to works of piety. Prominent among these was a crusade to Finland, where Erik's bishop, Henrik, an Englishman born, later suffered martyrdom. It forms the subject of the larger part of the only mediaeval figure paintings that still adorn the cathedral at Upsala. Erik's repute as a saint was unwelcome alike to the family of Sverker and to the pretensions of the papal throne. Nor has he ever been formally canonized, although the Curia acknowledged his merits and worship later. The love of the people waited for no such confirmation, and Sweden thus obtained her patron saint without the aid of Rome. Erik was buried in the cathedral of that date which then stood in old Upsala, and which he possibly

completed himself. The date of transferring his remains in 1273 to the present cathedral of Upsala, where they are enshrined in a golden receptacle behind the altar,[3] was retained in our calendar as the Translation of Erik (24th of January) until one of those unhappy reforms with which our country is now and again beset arbitrarily exscinded the commemoration. In the preface to the Church Law of Laurentius Petri, Erik concludes the series of "God-fearing Swedish kings" who were at pains

> "that the faith of Christ be also planted and extended here in Sweden; such as, for instance, the first King Björn, who has caused that faith to be preached by calling in St. Ansgarius and others as evangelists. And again, a good while after, King Stenkil had preachers summoned to the kingdom, especially two, Adelward and Stephan. And after him, Olof secured from England the pious Bishop St. Sigfrid and his comrades. But King Erik Jedwardson has for this sake won especial commendation among the men of Sweden. For it is said of him that he hazarded and suffered much both at home and abroad for the planting and growth of the faith of Christ."

Remoteness itself was an obstacle to the effectual Romanizing of the Swedish Church, however many pregnant impulses and excellent ideas emanated from Rome. Canonical law endowed legality with more fixed forms and more certain expression at the same time that the rules of the canonical law were in part mingled with, or replaced by, customs of home growth. It is not improbable that even Christian worship, in certain

[3] The official investigation of St. Erik's relics, which took place under the supervision of the Chapter of Upsala on the Wednesday of Holy Week this year (31 March, 1915), confirmed the narrative of his death, contained in the *Legenda Sancta Erici*, from the end of the thirteenth century (the epoch of the translation of the remains from Old Upsala to Upsala). According to the *Legenda*, the pious king was knocked down after a fierce fight, his enemies heaped wounds on him, and in their frenzy they irreverently cut off his venerable head when he was half dead already. The skull and the bones, well preserved through the ages, show distinct marks of heavy blows on the inferior unprotected parts of the legs, and a wound from a pointed weapon on the top of the head. The split neck-vertebra, that has been put in a special fine sack, shows a blow on the right side of the neck of the prostrate king. This blow has not at once entirely severed the head from the body.

districts at least, was formally resolved at the assizes. Later, even in ecclesiastical affairs, the congregation perpetuated the self-government practised at the assizes. The early Swedish provincial laws, which are our oldest great literary monument preserved, have something to tell us about this. The people in the parishes elected their own priest, and the episcopal demand for the right to appoint him was never quite pressed home. The parish vestry, by the sanction of the Reformation, continuously kept the ancient right of peasants to self-government. Whatever the changes of time and custom in the matter of electing the priest, the congregation maintains even in our day the right to appoint its own priest among three proposed by the cathedral chapter, and in certain cases even outside their recommendation. Women have the right to vote, as well as men. It is a great pity that a disastrous impulse towards uniformity has lately robbed us of a good deal of healthy remedy for frequent sins of domination by the system of majorities.

The people legally had their own word to say even in the election of bishops. According to the older laws of West Gothland, the King was obliged to consult the people before he conferred the ring and staff upon the man so elected. When in later days the cathedrals gradually obtained their canons, and the chapters came into being, the title to elect bishops was more or less transferred to them. The development peculiar to Sweden, which her cathedral chapters exhibited after the Reformation, has retained a lay element in the elections; but this must now be considered too small in most dioceses. Yet there is no obstacle to a layman being elected and appointed bishop. During the previous century this occurred more than once. Nowadays laymen are not so often complimented with votes at these elections. But one cannot avoid the impression that laymen so honoured would generally make excellent bishops.

Another proof is forthcoming of the unbroken con-

nection between the priest and his people in the early Middle Ages,—the right of the priest to marry. This was stoutly maintained and preferred to the life of improper liaisons, concealed more or less, which were the easy result of enforced celibacy in prosperous circumstances. Curiously enough, the Synod of Linköping did not pronounce on the point. The matter was resumed in good earnest at Skenninge, a century later in 1248, when a Synod was held by a papal legate, William of Sabina. In a report despatched by him in the presence of the Archbishop, five suffragans of his, and many others, over half deals with marriage and children of priests. "*Fere omnes sacerdotes erant presbiterorum filii, patrum vestigiis inherentes, contrahendo sollemniter matrimonia vel publice concubinas habendo in sacris ordinibus constituti.*" When Olavus Petri, in 1525, entered on the holy estate of matrimony, and many priests followed his example, thereby inaugurating an institution, the homes of priests, which has been of incalculable importance, not alone for recruiting the servants of the Church, but also for our general culture; and when it was enacted by the Riksdag at Västerås, in 1527, that the wills of priests should be proved according to the statute book like those of other yeomen, a moral and legal tradition was renewed which had not been long interrupted. The legate's letter begins by confirming the distressed state of the country in temporal and spiritual conditions alike. A hint of the former is briefly given: a state of war existed between the King and a number of leading men. Spiritual wretchedness is described in detail as prevailing in the married life of priests and their children's right of inheritance. The condition most severely condemned is the solemn wedlock. Wives that are kept a year more are to be excommunicated, but not without the opportunity of episcopal dispensation for priests and their wives above fifty years old, under a vow of continence. Moreover, sons and relatives com-

mit mortal sin if they accept inheritance from a priest. On the other hand, the latter is entitled to make bequests of his own to whomsoever he will. Special protection is promised to those priests who live unmarried, or who do not have concubines openly. The priest is excommunicate who acknowledges as his own sons that are born after the prescribed year, either by maintaining or rearing them at his own home, or by openly providing for their sustenance and calling such persons his own sons. In addition to lawfully wedded wives, concubines are mentioned in the second place; in one passage the order is *concubina vel uixor*, and it comes to the same thing, according to this view. But repetition and emphasis are persistent on *publice* and *cohabitans* (*concubina*); thus a careful perusal of the document gives the impression of forbidding unconcealed and loose cohabitation as condemned almost equally with the moral wedlock of the priest, and this is essentially even worse because of the acknowledged right of children to inherit. It is chiefly the publicity of the case that is *sub judice*. So much for the most interesting document Sweden possesses regarding celibacy. It dates from a time when, prompted by enthusiasm for Christ and spiritual tasks, many a man or woman freely and joyfully chose the unmarried state.

For better or for worse, the Roman system thoroughly penetrated into our Northern kingdom either quite late or not at all; yet church law drove its roots of constitution and culture so deep into the life of the State and the feelings of the people that it largely outlived the new growth which most seriously interfered with the record of Christendom in Western lands. It was by no accident that Sweden retained the episcopal office in the church reformation of the sixteenth century. It was with full consciousness of purpose that the especial patron and supporter of reform laboured for it,—he who championed the King's church policy, Laurentius Andreae, Archdeacon of Strengnäs and Royal Chancellor—only

to reap at last a sordid ingratitude for his inestimable services to the fatherland. His decisive plans for the organization of our Church were carried out by Laurentius Petri, brother of the reformer Olavus. The preaching of the Word was all in all to Olavus, and ancient regulations of little or no concern so long as they did not join battle with the Gospel. The King's motive for preserving this office of the ancient Church probably had no very deep roots, if we may judge from passages in a letter to Magnus Sommar, Bishop of Strengnäs, November, 1527, to the effect that the King could well conceive how discontented the peasantry would be to forego any longer anointed bishops, albeit anointing is of little necessity; "therefore, if Sommar wished to abide by his election, he should receive consecration and anointing during the winter". The King was nevertheless in fact solicitous for the unbroken succession of bishops, and it was not until later that he felt disappointment and chagrin with the Church and the bishops for refusing to be treated as dependents and tools. Sommar was consecrated with two other newly elected bishops, on Epiphany, 1528, at Strengnäs, by Petrus Magni, who had received his consecration as Bishop of Västerås, at Rome. And it was these two, Magni and Sommar, who transmitted to Laurentius Petri the vocation of bishop in the Great Church of Stockholm, on September 22, 1531.

The succession of formal validity in the Swedish episcopate has, therefore, been acknowledged, even on Roman Catholic assumptions. Bishop M. J. Spalding, a North American authority on Roman Catholicism, wrote in his *History of the Protestant Reformation:*[4] "The reformation in Sweden was thus far more adroitly managed than that in England." The explanation is furnished in the text:

"Accordingly, as a preliminary stage, he now appointed Laurence Petri, brother of Olaus, Archbishop of Upsala: and through the

[4]Vol. 11, p. 424, note 2 (New York, 1875).

management and false promises of his wily chancellor, Lars Andersson, he finally succeeded in inducing, first the Bishop of Västerås, and then the Bishops of Åbo, Skara and Strengnäs, all his own creatures, to perform the ceremony of consecration. The consecration having been duly performed by bishops having undoubtedly the episcopal character themselves, though uncanonical and unlawful, was certainly valid, and thus the present Swedish Lutheran bishops, unless the rite of consecration has since been materially altered, are invested with the episcopal character; though, being severed from the communion of the Church, they have no canonical jurisdiction or any lawful authority whatever."

However, that memorable day, September 22, 1531, implies far more than a pious formality. The Reformation Parliament at Västerås, in 1527, expressly preserved for the bishops an independent authority, with the reservation that it should no longer be confirmed by the Pope in Rome, but by the supreme head of the kingdom. The open letter of the council on the Västerås recess, dated June 27, 1527, runs:

"Yet shall no man turn this decree of our most gracious Sovereign Lord and ourselves to our endamagement, provided His Grace or we will it that no bishop should surcease from his office, nay, but it is our pleasure that bishops may and shall be appointed, and yet not so powerful that the King or his realm may be endangered thereby."

As Professor K. A. Appelberg writes, "The office of bishops survived as the directorate of the Church." This was all the more remarkable because during the time of union with Denmark, a critical one for the independence of the kingdom, the occupants of our sees had not generally observed what appertained to their welfare, but misunderstood the vital needs of the realm. One Nils Ragvaldson of Upsala and one Thomas of Strengnäs had in that respect been exceptions. In the eyes of reformers the office of bishop had implied a protection to the independence of the Church. To the King it became afterwards a perpetual obstacle, and, therefore, at the end of his reign he called in the aid of Georg Norman, an esteemed Pomeranian, to establish a system on German models, with overseers as mere instruments of government and church administrators in the King's behalf but lacking any scope for episcopal

authority. The most unyielding perseverance from the noble Archbishop and the tenacity of tradition were required to ward off Erastian caesaro-episcopal domination from the character of our Church. The tempest passed; and in the church statute of 1571 (that heritage which Laurentius Petri had the privilege to bequeath to our Church before he passed hence) we read concerning the vocation of bishops:

> "Therefore as this enactment was most profitable and without doubt proceeded from the Holy Ghost, it was sanctioned and approved over all Christendom in general, and has ever since been, and evermore shall be, so long as the world endures."

The continuity and authority of the Church was represented by the episcopal office, and the demands of the kingdom were vindicated by the supreme head; opposition between these threatened to become disastrous under Gustavus Vasa, the founder of the new kingdom of Sweden. But this tension was no new thing. We have discerned it through the Middle Ages, and it has never ceased in our Church. It has at times been embittered, and has assumed grave forms in one way or another. But it has never been a sign of health when it seemed to be entirely removed; on the contrary, it partakes of the very existence of the Church. Just as the faith is not of the world but in the world is causing ceaseless unrest side by side with heavenly security, even so while the Church remains loyal to supernatural Christianity she can never realize her essential quality nor win trustworthy comfort from an organization, be it never so perfect. When God's work is most mightily comprehended, it is displayed before our dim human sight rather under the fashion of inconsistencies which we cannot simplify into a united scheme without relinquishing something of what is indispensable to our experience.

In his Olavus-Petri lectures, in 1912, in the University of Upsala, on *Church and State*, Professor Harald Hjärne

has shown how the tension cannot be eliminated by any art of church policy without peril:

"However these powers may be conceived, on both sides the leading principles must always be inexhaustible sources of divergence in the management and promotion of society, not only between different parties in the State, varying faiths, Churches and sects, churchly and worldly trends; but also between powers of State as such and the living Christianity in the Church or Churches. It is equally true of Christianity, as it was in the beginning, that her preaching must continue to be 'to the Jews a stumblingblock, to the Greeks foolishness.' "

The strain between the Church and State reached its fiercest climax in the reign of Gustavus Vasa's youngest son, who rescued and continued his father's empire building, Duke Charles of Södermanland, afterwards King Carl IX (d. 1611). Archbishop Abraham Angermann's violence was partly responsible for the tension. But the days of his successor[5] showed that a deeper cause lay in the King's Calvinistic tendencies. The struggle assumed its most imposing form under his son, the greatest monarch of the Swedish Empire, whose reign both betokened and introduced the proudest period of Swedish episcopacy. Then both parties were led by pre-eminent personalities, and so the gist of the matter came into view. On the monarchical side, in 1623, there was proposed the carefully prepared measure of instituting a *Consistorium generale mixtum*, following German types; and this was to be regularly convened in Stockholm. Many reasons promoted an increase of unity and facility of operation in church government. Self-opinionated bishops were not always useful in their own dioceses. But hesitation penetrated deeper. No one wished to sacrifice the aegis of liberty for obvious but comparatively superficial profit. The clergy declared in the Parliament of 1624 that the proposed scheme might well have the result "that the highest calls of God's congregation

[5]The controversy between King Carl and Archbishop Olof (Olaus Martini) can be studied in four learned writings of 1604 and 1606, two by the King and two by the Archbishop.

should fall into the hands of politicians, who would become supreme governors and judges of God's people, contrary to His law and the rightful customs of His flock". "The new imperial papistry", as it was called, was later on an object of dread. Deep concerns were clearly at stake. Let the superconsistory take what form it will, the Church does not thrive by being reduced to a department of State, however well managed.

Similar tendencies in our day have lost touch with the more sagacious clergy and laity, though one or another would gladly take a short cut to avoid the burdensome way of the hierarchy, and many are inspired by a kind of trades unionism in the Church. On behalf of such a combination her spiritual existence only implies a fantasticalness which, although compulsory in the pulpit, is never to be considered as a reality of life. Prelatical tendencies could not be more excellently illustrated than by John Rudbeckius, Professor of Upsala, court preacher to the King in the Russian war (1614–16), Bishop of Västerås (1619–46), a Titan in capacity for work and learning, the coping-stone of bishops in the golden age, who offered undying services to the spiritual advance of Sweden. His devotion to education and research was as sincere and effective as his zeal for the faith of the Church. In reshaping the life of schools, Rudbeckius was a genius. He endowed Sweden with its first high school, in Västerås, and this ought still to be called after him. Whatever his mind conceived or his hand touched bore marked traces of him. It does credit to Rudbeckius but still more to his King that his fearless utterances and exceeding susceptibility for the rights and honour of the Church, as he understood it, did not shatter the personal relations between them nor disturb "the continuance of royal favour". It was only after the King's death that Rudbeckius gave the unrestrained expressions to his prelatical demands in his much debated "*Privilegia quaedam doctorum, magistrorum,*" etc.,

from Västerås, 1636. Here the whole case for mental culture is identified with that of the Church in a manner that displays an imposing ideal for Church and education alike. But pretended rights were based on privileges and regulations long since disused, and the standing and authority of prophets and priests (among Egyptians, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Indians, Greeks, Romans, Celts) was represented as a model likely to humiliate the government. Certain remarks were so offensive that Rudbeckius was summoned before the council. The matter probably cost him his archbishop's throne, for it was vacant in the same year. But this man was not totally blind to the fact that the counterbalance of State supremacy is beneficial, nay, needful, to the Church. He is the originator of the oft-quoted remark which justly represented the tension we speak of. In 1636, Johannes Rudbeckius spoke thus before the Council of State:

"In Germany they have dealt hard measures to religion since the Reformation. The realm has accommodated itself to the prince. But we here, God be praised, have had it better. If the supreme head (*magistratus*) had wished to act as it behooved him not, the clergy has curbed him: for the past hundred years the highest power has also kept an eye on the clergy."

The relation between the Swedish Church and the realm obtained its classic expression in the phrase used by Gustaf Adolf to Axel Oxenstjerna, from Jönkoping, Feb. 18, 1629, about "the majesty of our fatherland and God's Church therein, which is right worthy of man's suffering hardships for her, yea, even unto death". Its pithy terseness is telling enough to repudiate the idea of a mere office or department of State. The King accounted Christianity on earth as a society called and gathered by the Spirit. The sentence expressed well enough the King's feeling for Church and State. For it is not isolated; on Sept. 12, 1628 (the autumn before), he had written to his sister Catherine, Countess Palatine, the future mother of Karl X. Gustaf, from his camp

at Ossan, concerning his hope "that before long some good shall be accomplished for the safety and utility of the fatherland and God's Church which dwells therein". And earlier in the same year, April 1, 1628, a letter to the Chancellor refers to God's "holy congregation in our fatherland". Gustaf Adolf's conviction of the majesty of the realm was no less conspicuous than his sense of the Church's steadfast greatness in its own divine authority. He never dreamed of aught otherwise. In his funeral oration Johannes Rudbeckius bore witness that "he preserved the freedom and safety of the pulpit: freedom to preach the truth was ours, and with open mouth to declare to Israel his sins, and his misdoings to the House of Jacob; and no man could therefore trouble or harass us". Moreover the prelates could scarcely forget or mistake their sovereign's right at a time when our Church was permeated with the historic vocation of the kingdom; nay, more, when it might appear that Sweden's fullest destiny lay in its battle for the steadfastness and advance of evangelical piety. For Rudbeckius and his compeers the past destiny of the realm implied a revelation from God no less surely than that of Israel did for the prophets. To their minds the great goal of Swedish politics was a task bestowed by Heaven for the genuine maintenance and advancement of the faith.

In actual fact impulses towards the government of the Church by the throne have been more perilous in other times. This was the case when Johan III wished to impose by superior authority his well-intended and beautiful improvements in religion, which were too weak and fanciful for the needs of his day. The climax was reached during the reigns of Karl XI and Karl XII. But an epoch which bestowed upon us the Church Law of 1686 was so saturated with a manful and unsullied piety that the danger from imperial papistry became actually less real than when Gustaf III's government

of the Church, though less dictatorial, fell short of a true religious spirit.

But no Swedish monarch has been officially acknowledged or has claimed to be the *summus episcopus*. That is an imported heresy without meaning in a Church whose episcopal succession is unbroken. It was thoughtlessly accepted and honoured for a period of the last century as a linguistic term. The title (*summus episcopus*) has never once trespassed into the Västerås ordinal nor into the mandate for Rogation Days, in which, from 1544, the King of Sweden annually greets and exhorts his subjects in the faith. So far as is known no official document can anywhere be found in which the King's title is anything like the Supreme Governor of the Church. Every Christian is bound to do his best for the purity of faith and morals: in the same way a more pressing obligation is incumbent on the sovereign: he must in the capacity of *nutricius ecclesiae* ("nursing-father of the Church") banish irregularities that are likely to hinder the soul's salvation and the advent of God's kingdom. Such a duty and right of reform might be accepted by the sovereign as a pretext for encroachment on the Church work which in no normal conditions belongs to his authority. Necessity knows no law, but precedents of this kind do not establish a *summus episcopus*. And special interference was, generally speaking, sorely needed, not only because no kingdom can exist without the unqualified submission of every man to common law and statute, but also for the actual sake of religion itself. Unhampered dictation from the Church and priestcraft pure and simple have proved most perilous for the faith. There is scarcely any surer way of fostering the interests of domination and worldliness in the Church than to make her as supreme as possible. The alluring ideal of churchly "liberty" in the highest possible degree exempt from the influence of the secular society is a dangerous hallucination. In that

case the religious community may well become a suffocating oppression to the spirit. The much bepraised "clear lines" often lead to worse complications and miscalculations than a watchful use of agents apparently incompatible which Providence has placed in the way.

The cathedral chapters, the record of which Professor Holmquist has elucidated, belong to the history peculiar to the episcopate in Sweden. They were retained at the Reformation, but their function and cohesion weakened during the following decades. Our Church Law of 1571, the first after the Reformation, restored them; they were no mere lifeless survival, and this appears most clearly just when the Upsala Synod of 1593 fully authorized the Reformation in our country; then the priesthood made the cathedral chapters a *desideratum.* Their character was simultaneously changed so that the place of prelatical chapters (whose duties were chiefly liturgical) was taken by chapters consisting of teachers with real powers of decision, presided over by their bishops, in matters concerning church affairs and works of education. They also acted as a court of justice. In this sense cathedral chapters in Sweden have acquired a greater authority and importance than elsewhere. Of this, too, Rudbeckius was the actual originator, and Västerås the pattern, since the "readers" of the new high school obtained in 1623 capitular standing and votes. The peculiar nature of cathedral chapters then emerged all the more clearly as purely spiritual and churchly authorities, in contrast to the idea of a consistory as an instrument of church government to the sovereign. The development brought different forms into existence; in Upsala and Lund they consist of professors of theology, together with the dean and the bishop; in Stockholm, of rectors; in the other chapters of the realm, of the bishop, dean and "readers" (schoolmasters) in the high schools, and thus laymen are in the majority in these chapters. But this is owing to a

rather recent development which has secularized the high schools. As Dean Lundström acutely remarks the *lectors* (readers) were clergymen at Rudbeckius' time, and this continued to be the case for about two centuries. If national education reflects the fairest honour of the Swedish Church, a just share in it must be allowed to the cathedral chapters. When in our time school work in the higher and lower grades, thanks to the Church, has matured, according to the law of development it has consequently obtained its own central boards of management. We hope that this secularization can now proceed without detriment to national education; on the other hand, it constitutes a power in the Church for concentrating her closest function upon religion and morality. This change must doubtless produce a gradual reshaping in the construction of cathedral chapters. Moreover, it may be hoped that membership *ex officio*, which has hitherto contributed to independence and authority in the chapters, may not without absolute necessity be surrendered in favour of election.

Diocesan synods of the priesthood passed over to the reformed Church with the episcopal constitution. This venerable institution survives under the title, "Synod of Priests" (*prest i möten*). The mediaeval councils of the Church province had a succession of followers, among which should be mentioned the National Council at Örebro (1529), and Upsala (1571), as well as the eventful Upsala *Möte*, in 1593. During the constitutional government by the Estates that of the priests formed the representation of the Church. After the abolition of Estates Parliaments (1865), a new convocation which had been demanded earlier was instituted, irrespective of changes in representation; it came into operation in 1868. It acquired a double standing of a peculiar kind: on one side it represents the Nation as a Church; on the other, it maintains the authority and guarantee of the Church by the side of the Riksdag. It is convened

regularly every five years and is composed of priests and laymen in equal numbers.

(2) The same conservatism which we found in the church organization is marked by the outward appearance of the congregations in communion with God at public prayer. The Swedish Church has been more loyal than any other evangelical body in preserving liturgical traditions.[6] J. Martin, the distinguished Roman Catholic Church historian, writes with perfect justice, "Even today the Swedish missal based on that of Olavus is possibly the least estranged from the Roman Catholic missal."[7] A picture of the crucifixion which adorned the Upsala missal of 1513 was taken over in "The New Testament in Swedish", of 1526. This loan, observed by I. Collijn, is a symbol of the process of transition. Certainly Olavus Petri, like Luther, developed in the sphere of liturgy new versions of hymns, ingenuous and pithy, as well as of prayers and other formularies. The *Confiteor* (*Jag fattig syndig människa*, "I, a poor sinful creature") read at the beginning of our High Mass, before the congregation confirms it by singing the ancient *Kyrie*, gives evidence to later ages of the strong inner feeling of our reformer and his arresting simplicity of expression. Every living thing grows: and it also appertains to a cult to set new seedlings during the church springtimes. But the piety that silently animated our reformers retained everything of the old mass ritual that was not inevitably excluded by the new purified piety. Although a certain violence was shown

[6]Ancient codices of parchment were extensively used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as covers to bind up accounts. The parchment sheets examined by I. Collijn, head librarian, are derived from liturgical books, missals, breviaries, hymnaries, and other liturgical manuscripts from the tenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth. The preponderance of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman books of ritual indicates the strength of English influence in the early Middle Ages. This has left a stamp which still endures in our liturgy.

[7]*Gustaf Vasa et la réforme en Suède* (Paris, 1906).

in the first enthusiasm for new works of the spirit, *e.g.* in the fine array of texts and subjects in the church year, yet as O. Quensel, the liturgiologist, has shown, the early church system of short passages from Epistles and Gospels with Collects was soon resumed. Thus the services continued to be framed in a larger cycle coincident with the whole course of the year. On the other hand, it is evident that it was not due to the Swedish reformers that our course of texts for the year was dislocated from those of Rome. For on this head the similarity is not between the Roman Missal and English Prayer Book as against our own manual; but the use of the Protestant Churches follows mediaeval custom with special closeness, as is certified, for example, by the Upsala missal of 1513; whereas the revision sanctioned by Pius V, in 1570, undertook alterations in the Roman missal. The comparison with the Upsala missal of 1513 instituted by Deputy Professor Westman thus shows that the Swedish Church book was similar to the present Roman missal in dropping the Collect on the Third Sunday after Trinity, by which from this Sunday inclusive we fall a week behind the ancient order still retained in the Prayer Book. So in the Third Sunday after Trinity we pray: "*Protector in te sperantium Deus*" ("O God, the Protector of all that trust in Thee"), whereas the same petition is read in England on the Fourth Sunday after Trinity. The fine old Collect for the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity: "*Deus qui omnipotentiam tuam parcendo maxime et miserando manifestas*" ("O God who declarest thy almighty power most chiefly in showing mercy and pity") is read in Sweden on the Tenth, etc. But in addition the Roman missal of 1570 shows an anticipation, so that the Sundays after Trinity are reckoned no longer after that day but after Whitsunday. Thus Trinity occurs first after Whitsunday but has transferred for its own use in the Roman ritual the old Collect which is still read in Sweden and England on the right

Sunday, the First after Trinity. Thus Rome is a week behind throughout the season of Trinity. The First, Second, etc. after Trinity had come become in the Roman missal the First, Second, etc. after Whitsun, and by reason of the exclusion just mentioned of the Third Collect after Trinity, the Collects at Rome are read from this Sunday inclusive two weeks later than in the old order, while in Sweden we are one week after. With this difference of Rome being a week in advance (reckoning from Whitsunday instead of Trinity), the Roman Catholic Epistles during Trinity conform in the Swedish Church and in the English, and so do the Collects, except for the Sixteenth, Nineteenth, Twenty-first and Twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity (Whitsun in the Roman missal). The same Roman innovation of 1570 anticipates the Gospels after Trinity, but here Rome introduces further changes. Like the Anglican and German Churches of kindred faith in Prussia, Saxony, and other lands, we hear on the Fourth Sunday after Trinity the old Gospel of the day prescribed by the Upsala missal of 1513, St. Luke 6: 36–42, "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged". But Rome has removed the passage to the First after Whitsun, which coincides with Trinity, and on its Fourth after Whitsun (*i.e.* Third in our order and the old) the Roman Church now reads St. Luke 5: 1–11 (Simon's draught of fishes), which we and the others by mediaeval custom use two Sundays later, on the Fifth after Trinity; in this way, from the Third to the Twenty-fourth after Trinity inclusive, the Gospels come in the Roman Church two weeks too soon.

The Gospels for the last Sundays in Advent (Second, Third, Fourth) in the cases of the English, Prussian and Swedish Churches, come in the Roman missal in the first three, a week earlier in each case. Other disparities occur also, *e.g.* the Swedish peculiarity of celebrating the institution of the Holy Communion on Palm Sunday, whereas Maundy Thursday is, to our regret, not now a

holy day in Sweden, in spite of a far greater intrinsic right and value than the day following great festivals (*annandag*), and a number of other holy days. We also try to avoid needless reduplication in the sequence, as *e.g.* the Prussian Church has the passage St. Matt. 21: 1–9 both on Advent and Palm Sundays. Limitations of space forbid the citation of all the divergencies. The special correspondence between the Prussian and other German orders and our Swedish ritual is not borrowed from our Church manual of 1811 but is traceable to the Church Proceedings drawn up at the command of Gustaf Adolf by Johannes Botvidi and his German co-operator. This followed Swedish models for the diocese of Halberstadt and the archdiocese of Magdeburg. It was partially in use for nearly a century.

The new Pentecostal joy of worship in our Reformation was chiefly influenced by new clearness in the teaching of grace and vocation, which was joyously reechoed in church hymns, either translated or newly composed. But the gladness was also enhanced by the use of the mother tongue.

"We Swedes likewise pertain to God even as other folk, and the tongue we use is bestowed by God upon us equally with Hebrews and Greeks, to whom He gave their language. God is no respecter of persons . . . Therefore we Swedes do right well to have the mass in our own mother tongue."

These are the words with which Olavus Petri commends his Swedish mass, printed in 1531, but before then used in Stockholm. We marvel the more at the conservative spirit that as yet appointed no place in the liturgy for the sermon, although Luther, as M. Quensel observes, inserted it after the creed as early as 1526. According to the preface of Olavus just quoted, mass was not to be celebrated without a sermon which, however, preceded it and according to ancient custom stood apart from the liturgy. It was not until 1541 that the epoch-making statute came into force: "After the Gospel a sermon shall be made".

It would be easy to produce many evidences showing the persistence of the custom. In certain districts of our Church "Our Father" may still be heard in a whisper in the pulpit; a clear survival of the custom of reading the canon of the mass, and especially *Pater Noster*, with a subdued voice. Continuity is symbolized in the name, High Mass, also used in certain evangelical Churches in Germany in the eighteenth century, and with us the official title of our central worship today. Laurentius Petri preserved the title in his preface to the Church Law of 1571, in answer to his opponents:

> "Nor yet do we feel any twinge of conscience in calling the Lord's Supper the Mass, which they account a great sin."

Various estimates may be held of the pertinacity of ritual. Some complain that creative epochs in the history of revelation have neither tended nor been able to furnish new shapes for worship, but, like early Christianity and the Reformation, have transferred to a remarkable extent the rites and formularies they found. Others feel edification in the link made by the liturgy with past generations. Certain ceremonies are derived from ancient history. New conceptions of God and salvation have given fresh significance to ancient forms, and have caused the introduction of needed alterations. Ritual is comparatively changeless throughout the ages, while faith and revelation show their vitality by bursting through all forms, and their holy activity by pervading what is earthly. A certain indifference and unproductivity as to the external forms of worship are characteristic of the spiritual life of the Gospel. We shall discuss this later.

A few words should perhaps be added concerning what is purely external, that with which I began—the framework of the liturgy. Our Church has retained much that is ancient, without superstitious reverence, but also without slavish disrespect. My father used constantly to

wear the *stola brachialis* ("*handlin*") before the altar. It has now fallen into desuetude. In my young days surplices and albs were less often worn. The dread of revivalist piety for what was no more than an established usage contributed to this. Now vestments are more commonly used. Taste has changed. A morose ideal of truth, which was fostered by the reaction against all kinds of lax and untrue formality, commended to us as the one and only saving outward form of life, that of the dressing-gown. The worship of the congregation was also infected with it to some extent. But a feeling of "gladness and beauty in worship" has bid adieu to the commonplace. It is optional. There is no compulsion. Custom and good feeling set the rule. A quiet agreement, without legality, regulates matters of that kind. The Church manual says little of it. A few years back a church magazine published a meaningless face with some sort of reformed priestly robe under it. The outcome certainly was only gentle ridicule. The Church has no time to debate questions of toilet. We have something more weighty to fight for.

But the survival of official robes depended not alone on inertia, and the interest newly awakened in it is something more than merely aesthetic. There lay behind it, and still lies, the same yearning for beauty and holiness in worship which recently endowed us with certain marvellous new sanctuaries, after a long period of unimaginative building, on the type of the fashion-plate or the prayer-meeting house. "When, therefore, the priest celebrates mass, he robes himself as is wont." So the text ran in Laurentius Petri's Church Law of 1571. There, the vestments for mass and altar services are among the *res indifferentes*. But the aged Archbishop defends "those behaviours"—and it is characteristic that he does it in the name of liberty—against "enthusiasts, anabaptists, polluters of the sacrament, Zwinglians, and Calvinists", for he had no wish to be captured "under

the yoke of their thraldom". He maintains his right to beautiful and established forms of ceremonial:

"So when on our contrary part the Calvinists do shamefully treat all else that we inherit as rites from old time according to the ancient use of Christendom, they have in no wise better cause than some such as we have heard of. Let us not be troubled with their idle mouth and murmuring; for here we follow naught else but use as is wont, in the time of matins and evensong, with customary psalms, hymns, antiphons, lessons, responses, collects, and so forth, in Latin and Swedish alike. In the same wise we use at mass Christian songs, both in Swedish and Latin; likewise mass books, altar, altar linen, chalice, paten," etc.

Religion is the most personal of all things. But in themselves the sacred and divine words used in the High Mass are powerful and operate as a sacrament, even regardless of the herald that pronounces them. Can one marvel if he would fain conceal his small individuality under church apparel, and allow only the Word to proceed forth? In his heart no echoing response is lacking to the apostle's saying in Eph. 4: 24, embodied in the ancient prayer, legible over the door of the robe chamber in Upsala:

"*Exue me veterem hominem, Domine, cum actibus suis, et indue me novum hominem qui secundum Deum creatus est in justitia et sanctitate veritatis*" (O Lord, put off from me the old man with his doings, and clothe me upon with the new man, created in the likeness of God in truth, justice, and holiness).

Perhaps the Swedish temperament has betrayed a secret in the history of our liturgy. How easily is a certain inclination to pompous forms misjudged, a kind of rigid formality, which foreigners in Sweden soon discover! How often have we envied our neighbours their natural manner and easy ways! For stateliness with us is not always for its own sake but is a cloke for a certain awkward timidity. Shrinking delicacy gladly takes refuge in ceremonial and stiff behaviour. One hesitates to reveal all. This characteristic in our Church has been twice powerfully expressed. Firstly, in the districts of South and West Sweden that have been influenced by Henrik Schartau, who was vicar in

charge of Lund, and died in 1825. That is the most ecclesiastically disciplined portion of our Church. Sharply severing the worldly from the spiritual, Schartau reserved the latter for its proper occasions, and then accepted it with unusual seriousness and depth; but meanwhile no pious formality in speech or behaviour is allowed to degrade it, nor may it by such means encroach upon a natural and healthy manner. Secondly, in the hymns of Archbishop Johan Olof Wallin, who died in 1839. These are not seldom marked by a stiff solemnity, with splendour at times, and by a chastened rhetoric. It was the old but ever fresh truths of Christianity that he declared, with deep and manly comfort; seldom pierced, it is true, with heavenly illumination, but when it is, doubly powerful in its rapture. But his note is characteristic. The advance in worship gained by his hymns bears witness to a taste which underlies, perhaps, the conservative care for liturgical richness, but it is not a conservatism *quand même* that is the cause. This is shown by the notable welcome with which the Swedish Church accepted changes in venerable expressions that were found to be misleading. For example, "the resurrection of the dead", instead of "the flesh"; and "kingdom of death" instead of "hell", in the Apostles' Creed.

A popular reaction has been afoot against ceremony in worship and hymns. The groups, sometimes with justice but sometimes unfairly, called sectarians, have felt the need of more freedom in expressing tenderness and warmth; a movement which does not always avoid the descent to commonplace kindliness or unhealthy emotion. It would be a marvel if revivalists did not wish to doff the vestments of ceremony. The unregulated warmth of informal gatherings and their spiritual songs deserve a place in the Church alongside the mass and hymn book, but they are in error who imagine that we can do without these latter in the long run, for they are more tenacious than the occasional outbursts of transi-

tory revivals. Swedes hark back to the costumes of holy days. A story is told of a priest in Dalarna some century ago, who wanted to be so popular that he preached to the people of Sollerö in their own dialect. It fell out badly. They came very near taking his life, for they wished to use the King's Swedish when in communion with God.

Problems of the Eastern Orthodox Church in America

By Archpriest Leonid Turkevich,
Rector of the Russian Ecclesiastical Seminary, Tenafly, N.J.

Thirty or forty years ago North America heard but little about the Orthodox Church. This name was applied, as it still quite often is, to the Church of the Russian Empire and the four Eastern Patriarchates, with the Church of the United Kingdom of Greece. But in our days the idea of the *Eastern Church* must include the Church created in Japan by the labours of the late missionary Archbishop Nicholas, as well as the younger offshoot of the Orthodox Catholic Church which at present grows and increases on the hospitable soil of free America. As the statistics of this country now show the number of Orthodox people here to be 465,000, it is certainly worth while trying to learn what is the inner life of Christ's faithful in this religious group. It would not even be superfluous to make clear the relation in which this growing group stands towards other groups already thriving on the same soil of America. These questions are only the more interesting because in America the conditions of the life and expression of each of these groups are entirely different from their condition in the Old World.

The peculiar position occupied by Orthodoxy in America, shared by it, however, with other religious groups, is the fact that here it does not represent the supreme political power. Anglicanism is powerful in England to a considerable degree because there it is the religion of the sovereign power, of the more influential people of the country.

The same can be said of Roman Catholicism in Austro-Hungary, and of Orthodoxy in Russia. But on the continent of North America the three confessions peacefully exist side by side, one city erecting three independent cathedrals, St. John's, St. Patrick's, and St. Nicholas', and the strength of each group, its specific gravity, so to speak, being measured, not by the political influence of the people confessing it, but by the productiveness of each religious group in the ecclesiastical sense. In this respect we gladly adopt the point of view of the Honourable Seth Low, in an article published in THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY in 1913 under the title *Christianity in the United States*. True enough, nowhere under the sun is Christianity cut into more separate sections than in America. But at the same time in no other country do Christians of different denominations stand nearer to each other. The absence of political support makes all the Churches in America each others' equals, valued only according to the wealth of their inner contents; makes each of them, so to speak, worth only its real price. The absence of the possibility of predominance creates confidence towards each other. The habit of looking truth in the eyes makes people willing to acknowledge what is good, even in their opponents on the same arena. Hence their attitude is not very far from friendly intimacy, in accordance with the saying: When you understand, you love. This is our first thesis.

The peculiarity of the position of Orthodoxy, as of all the other religious communities in America, is that, away from the constraint of historically acquired standards whose power is almost absolute in the Old World, and pressed by new conditions of existence, it has to manifest its constructive power, changing to some extent what formerly was its own, developing new properties and even absorbing some things from the outside, from the territories of religious denominations which, were it at home in the old country, it could consider only from the polemical point of view. Therefore in America each confession not

only shows what is its real authentic essence but also its real qualifications for future existence among other confessions. It is stated, for instance, that the Roman Catholicism of America is in some ways already peculiarly different from the Roman Catholicism of Europe. It is also stated that there is a difference in the order of life of Episcopalians in England and in America. Actual life therefore confirms our second thesis.

The third peculiarity in the life of all the existing American denominations is that they are forced by life itself not to stand aside from each other. Often the prosperity of one group creates in another the impulse to make efforts and to use its strength. In a certain sense it is true that in America church life largely depends on the spirit of competition displayed by Americans of different Christian denominations. The activity of the press is so widely spread that isolated existence is impossible for different religious groups. The tendency towards publicity dominant in the country is felt even in the private life of every denomination. And it is no secret that none of them can conceal their good qualities which are verified and confirmed by everyday life. That Roman Catholicism stands above all others in religious discipline is indisputably acknowledged; the Episcopalians excel in the spirit of organization and self-government; the tenacity with which the Baptists carry on their propaganda wins the palm, and so on. It often happens that people change from one denomination into another for no theoretical reason but because the church life in their former group was not satisfactory to them and they think that matters are much better in the new group, which they accordingly join. As a consequence of this the leaders of every group do their best to preserve intact the good qualities they already possess and, at the same time, endeavour to acquire virtues in which other groups excel, so that they may at least not lose by comparison. Doubtless other peculiarities of a more special character could be found, but the

characteristics here pointed out are the most general and, in a way, those that define further qualities.

The question we must consider now is: In what way do the above-mentioned general features of religious life in America affect the life of the Orthodox Church? It is interesting to establish what are the strong points of the Orthodox Church in America, independently of the political considerations which may have supported it in Europe. It is important to know the direction which the manifestation of the creative power of this Church may and even must take in adapting itself to the conditions of its new surroundings. And, both for itself and the other denominations, it is altogether necessary to learn what sides of its life will be affected by contact with other denominations, which experiences of their life it will repeat, or, perhaps, improve.

Thus we establish the problems of the Orthodox Church in North America.

In solving this question we first of all have to take note of the unity of the religious consciousness which members of the Orthodox Church bring with them to America quite independently of the part of the Old World from which they come. On the foundation of deeply rooted traditions, they do not, once in America, build anew in the region of faith, but merely continue to preserve that which they already had. Seeds preserved since the days of ancient Byzantium begin to sprout up in the soil of the New World. Principles of faith established by the Christian Church in the days of its undivided existence and upheld by the Seven Ecumenical Councils continue to lie unshaken at the foundation of the religious consciousness of the Orthodox when they come to America. The unity of the religious consciousness of the Orthodox is not affected by difference in nationality. More than this: the many tongues spoken by them, the great distances between the places of their birth in Europe, Asia and Africa, mark only the more strikingly their wonderful unanimity

in spirit and in faith. In spite of the pronounced differences in their national characteristics, the unity of their Orthodoxy is strongly felt in the fact that quite independently of each other they import to the New World the sympathies and antipathies which all of them felt when they still lived in the Old World. In these they all agree most wonderfully. This feature is accompanied by another which is also very characteristic. This feature is the catholicity of Orthodoxy. Many members of the Orthodox Church step on American soil as such: Russians and Greeks, Serbians and Syrian Arabs, Bulgarians and Georgians from the Caucasus. The national features of every immigrant suffer no effacement whatever; yet in their faith they are one—they are Orthodox.

Their entire content with the spiritual treasure which came down to them from their remote ancestors and was so well preserved shows the manysidedness, the catholicity and the humanness of their faith, the Orthodox.

And so outside any political support, taken in its essence and also in its practical expression, Orthodoxy in America shows itself to be a confession of Christian faith as it was in the times of the undivided Church, stamped with the character of general applicability for humanity, or the character of unconditional catholicity. In speaking thus we say nothing new but merely bring out that which would not be noticeable on a non-American soil where there exist influences, national, political, and historically acquired, which would certainly dim its outlines and cause it to escape the attention of the observer; whereas in America the general applicability of Orthodoxy is the foremost feature that we notice. And indeed, besides the above-mentioned nations, there are other Orthodox in America, the aborigines of Alaska, the Creoles, Aleutians, Alaskan Indians, Eskimos, as well as immigrants from countries as remote from each other as Macedonia, Persia and Japan. The statistics so far claim but 254 pure-blooded Americans in the Orthodox Church

of America. Besides, on the island of Jamaica, there are some Orthodox negroes who came from Abyssinia. This great number of nationalities confessing the Orthodox faith without any pressure from an exterior power denotes still more emphatically its catholicity.

To be sure, catholicity stamps as well other Christian confessions enumerated in America. Some of them even make a point of writing this feature on their banner as distinctively their own. But some others, as for instance, the followers of Dowie, who call themselves Universal Christians, merely attempt to mark what is their ultimate object by using this word, whereas for the time being their fundamental teaching is something quite different. The very life nerve of the followers of Dowie is their faith in the continuity even nowadays of the prophetic vision of what life really is and hence the ability to make it better. There are other groups in which we observe the same characteristic of catholicity because of their practical ways in the present without reference to their future object. However, we must confess that all these groups, though possessing the above-mentioned feature, are not made especially distinctive by it as compared to others. They are marked much more visibly by features, historical and therefore partly local, in their origin or their original propaganda and establishment. To distinguish themselves from all these religious denominations the Orthodox of America have to add to their original title of Catholic Orthodox Christians the name of their own nation as well as of the nation through which they receive their Catholic Orthodoxy. This is the origin of the sometimes exceedingly lengthy names of Orthodox provinces in America. For instance, there exists a Russian Greek Catholic Orthodox Church and a Syrian Arab Greek Catholic Orthodox Church. By adding to the name of Catholic Orthodox the word Greek the members of this Church intend to prevent the possibility of being suspected of bearing the historical stamp of another branch of Christendom, which in ancient

days was centered in Rome and still continues to gravitate towards the local Church of this city and province of Italy. Another Church with the same character of catholicity and at the same time obviously with historical, ethnographical, and even geographical features, is the Church which is called Protestant Episcopal, though (merely from the point of view we have adopted in this article) it would be more correct to call it Anglican Catholic Protestant Episcopal. But, as I tried to mark above, the most characteristic point of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Episcopal Church, practically, is not in their catholic foundation, and not even in their historical and national traits, but in the whole order of their life: With Roman Catholicism it is in the definitely worked out and rigorously applied demands of discipline of thought and action; and with the Episcopalians it is in the breadth and yet entire strictness of self-governing organizations.

Not for a moment should we forget, however, when making this comparison the respective sizes of the Churches under discussion. The Roman Catholic Church in America has almost forty times more members than the Orthodox, and the Episcopal Church almost three times more than the Orthodox. But what we are concerned with chiefly is the inner significance and the exterior expression of the idea of these religious denominations severally. This is why we have put aside the purely theoretical and the speculative qualities of each confession. We are discussing the matter of the exterior position of the Orthodox Church in America among other Christian Churches. Therefore comparison with the other Churches is not to be avoided. It is only the more necessary because the Orthodox Church has in the two above-mentioned branches of Catholic Christianity examples of the solution of questions which it also in its turn must necessarily solve.

The word catholicity doubtless has its origin in the centuries when, widening the limits of their land through-

out all the accessible regions of the earth, the Graeco-Roman rulers thought of themselves as the possessors of the "circle of the earth." Christianity, which filled the emptiness of this "circle of the earth" with the miraculous power which regenerated it for a new life, naturally inherited from the Graeco-Roman world this same designation of its exterior character, and thus the designation of catholic came to be possessed by the Church partly by way of historical development and still more by way of reference to the commandment of its Founder: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). Consequently the Christian Church comes out in history as a universal or catholic force whose activity is directed towards the spiritual possession of the universe. But though we retain the sense of the word catholicity, which means universality or being spread everywhere, we must not ignore its other significance which was adopted by the Christian Church because of the very formation of the word, "gathered from all." This meaning already found its realization in the life of the Church through the calling of the representatives of all the Christian world to come to special councils with the object of solving problems of faith, morality and church rule which concerned equally all the faithful of the Church. It is remarkable that the Christians of the Greek Catholic confession retain to this day rather the second significance of the word catholic, so that in their speech it is synonymous with "ecumenical", or having representatives from every part of the whole which is governed in its totality.

Being present in most countries is also a feature of Roman Catholicism to an important degree. Besides a very wide geographical region this Church includes in North America a good many nationalities. In addition to the descendants of the ancient Romans, Italians proper, the Roman Church in America includes the French, the Spanish, the Irish, Germans to a certain degree; to a

smaller degree the English, Poles, Hungarians, Bohemians, Slovaks, and many other European nationalities; some Indians, Negroes, and some white people born in America. On the other hand, the principle of universal rule, so graphically expressed in the periodical gatherings of the representatives of the whole Church in general debating and legislating assemblies, without any doubt has been realized in quite the best form in another branch of Christianity which has the right to be named catholic, I mean the Episcopal Church. Having all classes of the faithful represented at its conventions, this Church illustrates in our own days to quite an important degree the fact recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, when for the purpose of discussing the question of accepting heathens into the Church (Acts 15:22), "it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole Church, to choose men out of their company."

We also must note the general way in which unity is manifested in catholicity, and also what is the instrument and exterior gauge of realized unity. We may say that no such question existed in the world of the undivided Church, because the whole mass of people making part of it spoke the Greek tongue by preference, which is confirmed by the fact that the books of the New Testament were written in this tongue, it being the more popular, the more democratic. In the meanwhile, in the Western part of the Church the Latin language struck deeper and deeper root, as the general conversational and ecclesiastical tongue. To this day this language remains the autocratic sacred language of the people who received the Catholic faith through the Roman Church, and who remain in union or rather submission to it. As far as the faithful of this Church are concerned, it is exactly this language which is the most general sign of their belonging to Catholic Christianity. Under the banner of this language other names are lost and even become superfluous as far as nationality is concerned, whether it is the French,

the German or the Spanish. Next after the oneness of belief and rule it may be said that the catholicity of the Roman Church is defined by the use of the sacred tongue of this Church, the Latin tongue. As the binding cement of this Church this tongue becomes especially noticeable through the fact that those who do not consider it necessary to the expression of their religious needs are cut off by this very circumstance from the unity of this Church, becoming separate confessions according to nationalities. In the United States, for instance, the statistics record "Catholic Polish Christians."

At the same time, in the Episcopal Church we may take for a sign of union the mother tongue of Americans, so that there are quite a number of people who do not hesitate to give it the name of the American Church without the risk of being misunderstood. The unity of belief and government is realized in this denomination without much effort, and naturally; whereas in the Roman Catholic Church the same unity is conditioned by practicing a long time the art of mastering a foreign means for the expression of religious thoughts and feelings.

In comparison with religious denominations so characteristically different in the outward signs of their inner unity, the special catholic character of the Orthodox Church becomes strikingly clear, as well as the practical problems it has to meet in the nearest future.

First of all, we cannot fail to notice the stamp of the catholicity of the Russian Church in the fact that this Church allows every national group of its members to use their own tongue for church use, without any confusion, mistrust, or sensitiveness. Greeks, Syrian Arabs, Persians, Slavs of various nationalities, Albanians, Eskimos, and in the later days the Japanese and the Chinese, hear the word of God, prayers and divine services in a tongue they all understand. The contents and the ritual offered to all these nations being one and the same, Orthodoxy

loses nothing from the use of so many different tongues, each tribe praising the Creator and Master of the Universe, the Triune God, in its own way. The Orthodox Church works on the principle of catholicity so trustingly that every nation in it is allowed to be governed by an independent Church of its own. Church unity suffers no detriment and is not shaken by such a superficial division, the Orthodox believes. Superior powers connect the local groups such as the unity of faith and signs of piety, the unity of the hierarchy and the sacraments, the unity of the Presence of Him (I John 4:4, Col. 1:18, Matt. 28:20) who is "greater than all that is in the world"; who "is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn among the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence"; who is "with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

Consequently the chief problem of the Orthodox Church in North America concerns the national Churches which make a part of it. Are they to be governed independently of each other? But in this case the canonical demand of there being only one bishop for every town, in order that there should be no division of this town within itself, risks being broken (Council of Chalcedon, 12th Rule). Or else, are they to be united by their submission to one representative according to the canonical rule, so that every Church should know its own intercessor (Apostolic Rule 34)? But in this case what will be the dominant exterior organ of the intercommunion between the different-tongued parts of the one whole?

It would seem that the Orthodox Church must choose between the two chief directions taken by the religious life of America, the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal. Shall discipline be allowed to become the binding link between the different parts, even with the acceptance of a single sacred tongue (the Greek, for instance, or the Slavonic), following the example of the Roman Catholic Church? But in such a case the national character of the Churches

will suffer detriment and the peculiar character of Orthodox catholicity will disappear. Or else, shall the preponderance of the principle of self-government be allowed to develop, as in the Episcopal Church? But in this case could the exterior organ of union, that is, the language of the country, develop to its full power even in the narrow limits of pure ritual? In other words, in this case will not the Orthodox Church of America become simply the American Orthodox Church, without any distinction between national groups according to the origin of early immigrants from the old world? The existence of national difference, however, will prevent the language of the country from becoming the language of church practices for a long time to come, as at present it prevents all the languages in use among the various communities from becoming *the* sacred language. Yet the Americanization of the Orthodox in this country is strong enough to force the members of this Church to have recourse to the neutral language—which to a good many of them has become the natural language—of all American citizens for all everyday affairs. It would seem that by this everyday use of the English language the Orthodox Americans are preparing themselves for the future exterior expression of their unity in faith and spirit. The one thing that still remains to be done is to condense into a single whole and to harmonize the demands of Orthodox discipline with the lawful manifestation of the principle of ecumenicity, in order to enable the Orthodox Church to manifest on American soil its natural character of universal applicability and its creative faculty of uniting organically all the elements within it, as well as its vital right to exist among other religious denominations, to its full power. Already the Orthodox Church practically stands on the basis of discipline; for instance, when bishops are appointed for separate national Churches. This was the case, in America, when the Archimandrite Raphael was appointed to be Bishop of the Syrian Arabs in Brooklyn; the Holy Synod

appointed him after communicating with the Patriarch of Antioch. But in each of these separate national Churches the shaping of their unity is as yet in process of being realized with the active assistance of both the clergy and the laymen in separate parishes only, and only partly in the whole mass of national groups. So far the principle of nationality has stood firm, the language of communication between the various groups being the local English. The form, which this harmonization of the unity of discipline and the diversity of nationalities has to take, is the problem of the Orthodox Church in America in the very near future.

Thus a sphere of immediate activity is already indicated for the Orthodox Church in America. It will not be a repetition of what has been done by Roman Catholicism, because the principle of catholicity will find a much wider expression, for into the bosom of the one Church any language and any tribe will be admitted, without being deprived of its national peculiarities (Rev. 14:6). The Orthodox Church will strive in America, as it has striven everywhere else, to realize the commandment of the ancient psalm singer: "That thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations" (Psalm 67:2). Its activity will not interfere with the activity of the Episcopal or any other local Church because in them the great diversity of nationalities does not exist. Yet to some extent the activity of the Orthodox Church will awaken in other religious groups a desire to reform or at least re-examine many phases which until now have remained somewhat vague. For instance, the question of the legality of nationality in pure Roman Catholicism is sure to come out in greater relief; also the degree of original independence which it would be legal for every national group to attain in their religious affairs; also more light will be shed on the question of democracy in religion, and limits will be established for the exterior means of drawing within the Church those who endeavour to avoid it; also

it will become more obvious that the character of Christianity is otherworldly, not of the earth, for Christianity is truly a rule of faith and life which is the "promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come" (I Timothy 4:8). In a word, because of its general accessibility and primitive purity and intactness, Orthodoxy may to a considerable degree become the very neutral spiritual medium which for so many Christian denominations in America has become obscured. The way in which the Orthodox Church may receive the impulse both from its own inherent life and from exterior circumstances for the realization of this great second problem is again a question of the future, perhaps the very distant future. The details of the solution of this question as usual will depend on the adequacy of the means and forces in its possession. Yet we should not remain silent concerning the first stage of the solution of this second problem, which is suggested by a good many rather important facts of a certain theoretical and practical solidarity among a number of the separate religious groups of the Orthodox Church in America.

Generally speaking, things are attracted towards each other from motives of their nearness in space and their inner affinity, especially if there is no obstacle raised by some unusual condition of their existence. Concerning the unusual conditions in the religious atmosphere of North America we have already spoken at the beginning of this sketch. We have already made it clear to what extent everything in America helps the *rapprochement*, the trust, the co-operation between various confessional groups in all their religious affairs. It only remains to define with some regularity the nearness and the affinity existing between these groups in order to allow their mutual gravitation to show itself to the full. Once you have taken this point of view, you can immediately become aware of the natural nearness between the representatives of Orthodoxy in North America and their next of kin who had been forced by historical conditions to place themselves

outside the Orthodox Church, without, however, losing altogether the signs of their belonging to that Church. Such are, first of all, the Russians and the Slavs who entered into the *Unia* with the Roman Catholic Church as long ago as the sixteenth century, preserving their Greek ritual almost intact and their mother tongue in all church services. And this is exactly the point on which the endeavours of North American Orthodoxy have been concentrated, trying to facilitate the return within its pale of all the religious national bodies which heretofore were part of the Papal Church in a merely mechanical way. As gradually they leave to join the Orthodox Greek Eastern Catholic Church, the Latin Western Catholic Church becomes relieved of all the elements which are alien to it and enters into the natural boundaries belonging to the region of Latin nationalities. In this case, Orthodoxy works at equalizing values in regions of church interests. The degree in which the legality of preserving nationality in religious affairs is the true backbone of Orthodoxy will define the degree in which its presence and activity in North America is bound to awaken the sense of national foundations in other religious bodies, inducing them to become clearer and more definite. However, this is the second, or perhaps even the third, stage of the solution of the problems of Orthodoxy in America.

We perceive much more clearly the first stage of the development of Orthodoxy's problems in relation to the Episcopal Church. The *rapprochement* between the latter and the Orthodox Church is rather of the chemical order, having been brought about by spiritual kinship and affinity. Besides, both the Churches remember their common origin from the East, from the Churches of Asia Minor of the times of Polycarp of Smyrna and Irenaeus of Lyons. The kinship between the two Churches is also demonstrated by the national colouring of both, admitted in theory and practice, as well as the theoretical confessional kinship proclaimed quite distinctly at least by a few

individuals who express the consciousness of the two Churches severally. We have not as yet become identical and are as yet far from intercommunion in the Sacraments, yet no one can deny the fact of mutual affection and friendliness between us, of which unfortunately there is so little where problems of religion are concerned. The solution of the special problems before the Orthodox Church, we indicated above, will guarantee the future peace of other religious denominations of America. Insofar as the Episcopalians are in possession of the correct idea of what the participation of national elements should be in the life of the Church, the Orthodox see quite clearly that between them there can be no strife and no animosity. Insofar as they dispense with preserving the doctrine in the shape which the undivided ecumenical Church has established, the Episcopalians are not Orthodox, but insofar as they decidedly protest against further digression from this doctrine and preserve the episcopate as the true gauge of their integrity and undividedness in thought and in act, in that degree also, from the Orthodox point of view, they retain their rightful place in catholicity and their nearness to Orthodoxy. The Orthodox people have sensed the impulse which moves the Episcopalians towards *rapprochement* and further union; and when the time comes to establish the union in principle, in theory, and in metaphysics, there will be no difficulty in our becoming true brothers in affection and unanimity.

Until now it would seem that the way of differentiation has been dominant in the history of humanity in general and of Christianity in particular. But it has reached the last stage of its development. The fragmentary condition of Christians in North America proves it altogether too clearly. But the hour is near at hand for the integration of disintegrated parts, for their reunion into a marvellously beautiful and well-proportioned organic whole. The bones that are dry and dusty, in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, are affected by the invisible breath of

God's spirit. In our days they are trying to draw nearer together. And though separately they hardly preserve the spirit of life, in contact and bond with each other they receive all that is necessary for life: arteries, flesh, blood, and, at last, the spirit of life from the Spirit of God. The conclusion of the prophet's vision, that is, the resurrection of all the divided creatures, who seemed to be lifeless, is the hope and expectation of human individuals; and, what is immeasurably greater, it is the Divine wish spoken in the prayer, That they all may be one.

Annunciation Day, 1915.

The Religious and Catholic Awakening in France

By Jean Rivière,
Professor in the Grand Séminaire, Albi.

On all sides there is no question of the religious awakening occasioned in our country by the terrible war which is covering our frontiers with blood. Not only do the organs of the ecclesiastical press open their columns without stint to the touching accounts of chaplains and the testimony of the combatants themselves, but writers who were lately indifferent are becoming interested in this renascence of faith, and religious recitals are assuming an unaccustomed place in the secular journals. Even the enemy is bearing testimony in his own way wittingly and unwittingly.

At the same time this undeniable fact has caused some surprise, especially abroad. "Laïc" thinkers, not very familiar with religious matters, have found themselves in accord with some pious believers and ecclesiastical personages in speaking of "miracles". One has been so accustomed to think of France as a land of impiety that the reawakening which we are witnessing must pass for something like a prodigy.

One cannot but admit that a certain number of facts had a tendency to justify this unfortunate reputation in the mind of the superficial observer. An old monarchical superstition, which survives all social transformations, leads us to judge a people by its official life and its government. Now who does not know that our rulers have made to themselves a law of systematic abstention in the matter

of faith and of religious practices? Under this official mask of neutrality, it is, moreover, only too easy to perceive the interior emancipation of "laïcized" souls, whose mental horizon is limited by a very positivist view of the world and of history, and which would think itself guilty of a lapse were it to show anything but polite indifference, always ready to turn into contempt, towards some of the most venerable beliefs of humanity. These sentiments have inspired a long-continued policy of acts of religious aggression, the melancholy succession of which is in all memories. In bestowing on these acts the sanction of a majority which increased with the voting lists, did not the whole nation seem to be taking a great share of responsibility in the work of universal secularization?

In his last Lenten Charge, His Eminence Cardinal Cabrières fairly brings into relief the bearing of these facts:

> "It has been believed outside that we had become a people without faith, and, confounding the political action of an active and powerful party with the real state of beliefs and of manners in the mass of the nation, people have allowed themselves to be taken by appearances and by the antireligious declamations of a few sectaries, as if these represented what the nation itself wishes and thinks."

If we add to this the atheism flaunted by many men of learning, the scandal of certain frivolous literature, or worse still, to say nothing of the grief of believers alarmed with only too good reason, is it not true to say that we had heaped up against ourselves the most numerous and strongest presumptions?

Nevertheless, there were here only appearances, at most, partial manifestations; and the religious soul of France remained, if not intact as it had been, at least still living and active. In spite of grave symptoms of death, attentive observers did not fail to perceive in the heart of our people the deep pulsations of life. It was but a few weeks before the war that Mgr. Gibier made known to a group of Parisian students the awakening of Christian life in the diocese of Versailles, which had been reputed, and not without reason, among the least religious.

"I declare to you," he wittily told them, "that the words of Charles V may be applied here with modifications: 'The French are steady-going people without seeming to be.' I would say: 'The French are Catholic without seeming to be.'"

Events were soon to show the whole truth contained in this spiritual paradox.

There was only weeping and groaning in the house of Jaïrus at that time when Jesus was summoned thither. Then the Master said: "The child is not dead; she is sleeping." They laughed at Him; but He took her by the hand, and the child arose. This scene of the Gospel comes back to one's mind as if naturally in presence of the spectacle which France presents to us today. The flame of religion may have seemed to be extinguished there: in reality, it was only smouldering, and, behold, souls that one would have called dead awaken at the unexpected call of the Sovereign Master. Between death and life there is no mean; but there is between the state of sleep and that of full activity. And that is why the vital movement which is today manifesting itself in so striking a manner, far from being a resurrection, is rather a reawakening. In observing the different features which mark its existence and extent, it is important for impartial witnesses, whether sympathetic or mistrustful, not to neglect the causes which have led up to them, the premonitory signs which might have foreshadowed their approach.

This immediate past is also connected with experience, and no scientific investigation would be complete which should not take it sufficiently into account. But who is there that fails to see that it betokens a power of resistance, and offers a guarantee of durability, which the believer must be sure to reap?

I.

A leading fact to be noticed, the most incontestable and most general, is the sudden outburst of religious sentiment, expressing itself outwardly in all the forms of traditional piety.

The most expressive, if not the most exact, of all the etymologies given for the word *religion*, is that which derives it from the verb *religare*. Religion, in fact, connects us with a mysterious *beyond*—beyond the sensible phenomena of this world—where reason, upheld by faith, shows us God, the Sovereign Master from Whom we depend in all things, the rigorous and holy Judge who watches over our conduct to demand from us an account of it, the Protector and Father from whom all good things come to us. Now this sacred bond of minds and hearts, we see re-established, or knit more firmly than ever. Everywhere, combatants and non-combatants are turning again towards heaven; and it is not to seek there the vague divinity of the *philosophes*, but the God of the Gospel, to Whom they pray and in Whom they hope.

While the Hebrew people were fighting in the plain, Moses was praying, with outstretched arms, on the mountain—a victorious coalition of material weapons and spiritual. The same alliance is being renewed under our eyes. To defend their country, intrepid soldiers are rushing forth on battlefields or burying themselves in dark trenches. At the same time an invisible general mobilization-order draws the rest of the population to prayer. In Paris the fact has assumed the proportions of a public event with which the great newspapers have more than once entertained their readers.

"Not only," Mgr. Baudrillart writes, "have the solemn ceremonies at the Sacré-Coeur, Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, Notre-Dame, in the presence of the Cardinal Archbishop, attracted immense and deeply moved crowds, happy to find in the vibrant words of their pastor, the echo of their own inner feelings, but every day these beloved sanctuaries see the mounting tide of the faithful ceaselessly renewed; the priests are not numerous enough for the duties they have to perform, while thousands of candles bear to heaven the ardent witness of the prayer of hearts. Every morning, in our Paris churches there are as many people as formerly on a Sunday, and people whom one has not been accustomed to see there."[1]

In every one of our churches the same thing, in proportion, is going on as in the great national sanctuaries.

[1] (*Revue pratique d'apologétique*, 1st Sept., 1914, p. 736.)

Everywhere the days of public supplication repeatedly ordered by our bishops have aroused a considerable outpouring of enthusiasm; priests everywhere testify that the regular attendance at Mass and the frequentation of the Holy Table have shown a marked increase. There is no centre, however slight its importance, where a special service of prayer does not bring together every day a numerous assemblage of the faithful. Lastly, there is nothing so touching as seeing the smallest chapels starred with lighted lamps, the soft flames of which, kept alive by pious hands, cease not day and night, at the feet of the Virgin or of the Saints, to recall to God the memory of the dear ones who are absent: humble, silent symbols, these, but so profoundly expressive, of so many souls prostrate in prayer on the soil of their country.

The soldiers, on their side, do not neglect the weapons supplied from on high. In the feverish days which preceded their setting out one saw an incalculable number of them besieging the churches, and accosting the first priest who came to listen to their confessions. They all eagerly accepted crucifixes or other pious objects; many of their own accord took care to furnish themselves with these. Even now cases are not rare of those who display, conspicuously placed on their breast, the miraculous medal or the image of the Sacred Heart. "It is my best shield," a corporal said to me, asking me to give him some medals for his men. Thanks to those medals, he boasted of having preserved his little section intact after six months of campaigning.

This first movement has only increased in the bitterness of battles or the monotony of long periods of waiting. Masses are said in the open air or in half-ruined churches: on every occasion numbers of soldiers make it their duty to assist. The great Christian anniversaries receive special attention, and we are told of bodies of artillerymen who of their own accord set out in quest of a chaplain to celebrate the Feast of Christmas at their solitary post. In

many of the trenches personal acts of piety are added to the liturgical prayers: the initiative of one soldier has been sufficient to start a recitation of the Rosary under the terrible *fanfare* of shot and shell.

When the hour of supreme danger comes, faith redoubles and bursts into full daylight. M. René Bazin, a laïc writer, tells us:

"You read letters from the front, published by the papers. You receive them, as I myself receive them: is it not true that they bear witness that, from end to end of the immense line of fire, our soldiers pray to God? . . . What a school, the face of death! What rapid teaching! And how naturally French hearts return to the Faith! . . . A young officer, wounded, was telling me that, at the beginning of the action, when his men were skirmishing, seeking shelter behind hedges, walls, embankments, almost all of them, and always as a perfectly natural thing, and as if it had been in the drill book, made the sign of the cross. It may be said that none of our armies for the last century has paid so much individual homage to God."[2]

If such are the dispositions of the combatants, those of the wounded are easy to foresee. Many, of their own accord, solicit the assistance of the priest; hardly any refuse it. An ambulance chaplain assured me lately that, among about 3,000 soldiers whom he had been able to visit, he had met with only one refusal. Many persons have communicated to the papers similar impressions. The temporary hospitals afford the same testimony. I may mention one hospital at Albi where the patients have signed a petition for the opening of a chapel in the establishment. The confessions there are no longer counted; it is not an unheard-of thing there even to see first communions and baptisms.

This religious movement is distinguished by a threefold character of universality, spontaneity, sincerity. It is similarly marked everywhere and among the most various kinds of men. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth": not only does its all-powerful strength act upon believers, to lift them to a new fervour, but it shocks the indifferent and takes hold of the incredulous upon occasion. Some pen

[2] (*Echo de Paris*, 3 November, 1914.)

with a delicate touch will one day doubtless write the story of the converts of the War. They will certainly be legion, and, if we are to judge of them by the *Confessions* already published by the newspapers, Christian apologetics will be enriched with some fair pages, simple and profound like the life of the souls they express.

Now is it necessary to say that in all this there is nothing official? The question for us to discuss is not, whether another state of things would not be better, and whether we should not regret the time when armies were taken to church as part of their drill-duty. But is it not true that this absence of all official direction in the matter brings the personal impulse of souls into stronger relief? In words and acts the public authorities display an attitude of neutrality; but on their own impulse the people of France are finding their religion again.

Besides, they are finding it again in its entirety. Sentiments are manifesting themselves naturally in words and acts. No more human respect: soldiers are not afraid to show outward signs of devotion. We might have thought that frequent communion was confined to a chosen number of pious souls, and everyone knows that confession was, for many people, opposed by an irresistible repugnance. Nowadays these practices have entered without effort into the normal life of a great number: the churches at the front are filled with communicants, and soldiers have been seen to ask for absolution in the public square or in compartments of railroad trains. It is remarkable that these actions never excite the astonishment, still less the raillery, of those who witness them.

Some of our adversaries, whose limited vision cannot go beyond the low horizons of politics, have even suggested that this return to religion was due to the secret manoeuvres of the clergy. The answer to this foolish pretension has been furnished by a noble patriot, whose heart, unfortunately, has not yet been touched by faith, M. Maurice Barrès.

"The churches are overcrowded with people, and prayers come back to lips which but yesterday were still mocking. . . . It is the effect of a vague undercurrent, of a great movement of souls. A war always produces a religious awakening, above all a war which concerns the race itself and appeals to the sublime powers in every man. . . . Do not lay it only to the anguish of hearts, the need to hope, to accept and to render thanks; seek not the cause anywhere but in the secret depths of consciences and in eternal humanity."[3]

"It is," says M. Paul Bourget, in his turn, "the combination of all the devotions starved for hope, of all the distresses thirsting for consolation."[4]

Such, in fact, is the explanation which imposes itself. The sentiment of God, always latent at the bottom of the human heart, sometimes becomes feeble under the pressure of worldly affairs or the attraction of pleasure. But as soon as trial comes, to break the illusion of these fugitive goods, the soul is again opened to the sense of higher realities. God was only forgotten; He appears again, like the sun after a momentary eclipse. It is the well-known law of "good suffering."

"Although the stars are always in the heavens," writes the apologist, Franz Hettinger, "yet we see them only at night. When misfortune has spread its veil over the life of man, it is then that he looks for, and sees, the stars of eternity."[5]

Israel needed the hard school of misfortune to tear it away from idols and bring it back to God: those pages of our holy books contain the eternal history of humanity.

No one can deny that religious life in France, at least in the mass, had undergone a notable decline. But the cause of this was less in the incredulity of the intellect than in the secularization of conduct. War has come to recall to everyone the imminent presence of death, the serious perspectives of eternity. It has been enough that they should be thus detached from the earth for them to find themselves free again, and again to take their flight towards God.

As for those whose faith had really become extinct, the moral generosity inherent in patriotic duty must have

[3] *Echo de Paris*, 2 October, 1914.
[4] *Echo de Paris*, 8 November, 1914.
[5] *Apology for Christianity*, French tr., vol. I., p. 388.

been the providential means of reanimating it. An immense sacrifice is imposed upon all Frenchmen, and this is accomplished with a constant and unanimous ardour, sometimes even with a splendid light-heartedness. Our soldiers, as one of our popular apologists has ingeniously said, have been placed at this time under the discipline of the cloisters by the heroic practice of poverty, chastity and obedience. "These men, these young men," writes a theologian, "have made as it were, an act of perfect charity towards their country."[6] And as much may be said, in a certain measure, of all those who from afar associate themselves by affection and sympathy with their devotion. Can one suppose that acts so meritorious count for nothing in the eyes of Him Who has promised that a cup of water given in His name shall not be left without recompense? Even for those who could not form any other prayer, there is here a prayer in act well fitted to attract those graces of light which the God of Mercies never refuses to souls with good will. Doing the Divine work, even under the abstract and anonymous form of duty, is it not serving God? And serving God is an assured means of arriving at the knowledge of Him.

To all this we must add the intellectual shock to men capable of reflection by those formidable events which are shaking the abodes of the old European world and by the truly extraordinary series of actions which have marked its course. Certain facts are such as to produce inevitably a religious impression. Thinking of our early defeats so magnificently repaired, M. Hanotaux writes:

"This wonderful recovery of fortune has about it something of the character of a *miracle*. A miracle of resolution and energy on the part of the leaders and of vigour on the part of the troops, and in addition to that, a miracle of France not willing to perish, a miracle of the immanent law of things and of the Divine Will that did not wish France to perish."[7]

[6] J. de Tonquédec, *Revue pratique d'apologétique*, 15 September, 1914, p. 803.

[7] *Histoire de la guerre de 1914*, vol. I., p. 149.

Moreover, "by the side of those who pray outwardly" we must count, according to M. Lavedan's expression, "those who pray inwardly without showing it."

And what shall we say of our statesmen whose patriotic eloquence almost always comes to the point of using religious language? One appeals to the "Sacred Union", another emphasizes the fact that we are living a "divine hour" or speaks of the "religion of country" or the "cult of the Flag"; all affirm the vengeance of the right and of "eternal justice." We may have pointed out, and with good reason, the abnormal character of those awkward reticences, and blamed that strange state of mind which keeps on official lips the act of faith that seemed to call everything in question. But may we not also see in such words as these the clumsy stammering of a prayer which dares not, or as yet knows not how, to shape itself more explicitly?

This religious blossoming of the French soul strikes one at the present time because it is bursting into full light and also because one is more attentive to it. Some exaggerate the importance of it as they had, before that, excessively darkened the picture of our impiety. In reality there is a strict continuity between these two extremes. When an abundant spring rises in the valley the most ignorant person guesses that it is not formed upon the spot but represents the outbreaking of long subterranean currents. It is not otherwise in the order of faith. The terrible conditions through which we are passing show and develop the religious spirit of France, but they did not give birth to it.

A wise psychologist would find the distant germs of it in that idealism and that love of the beautiful, in that instinct of native delicacy and chivalrous loyalty, which are among us racial characteristics and of which the present war has furnished new evidences. The lofty sense of good, the love of all that is noble and just, are they not a homage rendered to God, as they are a gift of His love?

More immediately, we must bring into the line of account family education and the memories of a Christian childhood. Few are the hearths where religion is totally absent. Often the father and almost always the mother, even if they do not set the example, take pains to teach their children a prayer; the lessons of the Catechism and of the First Communion complete the work begun. Now who does not know how profound are the impressions of youth? They may be blotted out in the whirlpool of life; but they remain always ready to reappear. "There are in all men", it has been said, "a surface man and an eternal man." The war has been for men the occasion of raising up "the eternal man" who was somewhat unknown and who sometimes did not know himself under the deceptive appearances of egoism and levity. Let not anyone be astonished if God and the soul resume their place in the heart of the people: "They are forgotten presences, the consciousness of which is resumed."[8]

To those who prefer more positive realities, let us recall in the last place the existence of a compact kernel of faithful souls. Often we have not given attention to anything but the indifference of the masses, forgetting that there were in France a chosen body of convinced and practicing Christians. Taine long ago gave this evidence:

> "The ascendancy of the Catholic faith . . . has diminished in the large mass and grown greater in the restricted group."[9]

Since then the influence of Catholic institutions in the upper classes and of enterprises for young people or for social action in the popular classes has not ceased to swell the numbers of the restricted group. Our recent literature has been seized upon by what we may call "the great mystic whirlwind" of modern times. In other regions the outgrowth of private teaching, the organization of the *Jeunesse catholique* and of the *Semaines sociales*, the prog-

[8] Tonquédec, *Op. Cit.*, page 801.
[9] *Origines de la France contemporaine. Le régime moderne*, Vol. II, p. 143.

ress of the Eucharistic Congresses, the abundance of theological publications, and the great influx of pilgrims to Lourdes or Montmartre are the signs of an intense religious vitality.

All these facts are known, but it has not always been noticed that this body of the faithful constitutes a force to which the mass will sooner or later give way. A little leaven leavens the lump. The example and the deeds of these believers form today a powerful factor; their part is increasingly to shake the inertia of the crowd and to sustain it in its waverings. Regarded thus in the light of its antecedents, the religious awakening no longer seems a revolution or an accident. It appears rather in its true perspective as a salient episode in a movement already real, a movement which has a future because it is connected with the best in the past.

II.

At the same time with this renewal of religious faith, it has been easy to mark a resumption of Catholic life. It is not only religion in general as a personal sense of divine things, it is also the Church which benefits by a spring blossoming in which, after the sleep of winter, the vivifying warmth of the divine Sun of souls is asserting itself anew.

Already we can see that the religious reawakening has brought, by a sort of natural attraction or pre-established harmony, the most characteristic practices of Catholic piety: external devotions, pilgrimages and popular ceremonies, frequentation of the confessional and of the Holy Table. So true is it that religion and Catholicism are among us intimately united. But these are features which more directly concern the ecclesiastical organization.

There results from all the correspondences which the present war has produced a return of affection and esteem for the clergy. If politics and part of the irreligious press have been able to scatter among the masses

certain germs of mistrust, these clouds are on the way to disappear. The reason of it is that there has never been a better occasion to show the good qualities of the clergy. "It is truly the war of the priests," wrote M. de Mun. "They are everywhere."[10] And everywhere they are giving daily examples of the most beautiful virtues, moral, social and religious. "The soldier priest," the Protestant Rocheblave has said, "such is the new type which the national history will have seen come into existence and which it will consecrate hereafter."[11]

It is certainly permitted to hope that the law will recognize the ecclesiastical immunity and, by so doing, emphasize with a special homage the spiritual character of the Church. But while waiting for the return of this ideal we could not exaggerate the benefits of the régime of equality imposed upon all citizens by French law. About 20,000 priests or seminarists have been counted mobilized. In this number there figure with the clergy of the parishes missionaries who have come from the Far East and religious who have returned from exile to defend their country. In many places applause has broken out when groups of Benedictines with their black robes, or Franciscans in their tunics, have presented themselves in the barrack-rooms. Everyone has been able to bear witness how the priests were in a large degree taking their part in the burden of national defence.

Some are officers and non-commissioned officers, most of them are private soldiers. There are some of them who carry arms while the great number are attached to the service of the ambulances. Those who were at liberty have set out to be chaplains. One thing common to all of them is the manner in which they have fulfilled their duty, whatever the form of it. No more courageous soldiers have been found, and no more devoted hospital attendants. Many have already had the honour of receiving

[10] *Echo de Paris*, 3 September, 1914.
[11] *Journal de Genève*, 6 October, 1914.

the highest military rewards, the public consecration of their heroism; many have fallen upon the battlefields or in the hospitals; all have borne away the respect and sometimes the admiration of those who see them engaged in their work.

In the ordinary course of life the priest is somewhat isolated from the people by the sacred character of his functions, and this fact may have given rise to certain prejudices. The common life of the camps, breaking the prescriptions of convention, has brought together hearts not less than lives. Among those who did not know the priest except by his official ministration it has been a great surprise to discover in him the most unaffected of comrades, the soldier always ready to sacrifice himself. Chaplains have been seen to lead on hesitating battalions to the assault, priests to replace at the front fathers of families, stretcher-bearers to expose their lives to save unfortunate wounded men. Such examples will forever be unforgettable. The priests on their side appreciate in this contact what moral value and religious depth is hidden under the sometimes light exterior of the French people. In knowing each other better they learn to like one another: the brotherhood of arms ends in a great union of souls.

With the clergy the war sets in relief our admirable religious women. While the men are discharging the rough duties of the fight, they are fulfilling the "ministry of pity." Without doubt a great number of lay persons share with them the office of comforting angels. But it is proved that in delicacy and devotion the *bonnes soeurs* have no rivals. One finds them everywhere, in the ambulances at the front and in the provincial hospitals. Many of the doctors have never wished for any other attendants; some of them have asked for their help after having undertaken to do without them. It is above all the soldiers that one must ask what they owe to their attentive care and moral comfort: there will be upon this point not one discordant voice.

Now priests and religious are the most authentic product of Catholic education. It is natural that we should judge the tree by its fruits. That is why the mass of the people is not wrong when by an instinctive deduction they refer the merit of individual works to the society which is their source: it is the very holiness of the Church and her spiritual life which one sees revealed in such a concrete case to ignorant and prejudiced souls. And it is easy to foresee the repercussion as these experiences are being multiplied at this moment by the thousands. Just after the Separation Mgr. Cabrières saluted, in a memorable discourse, the new Concordat which was established between the Church and the popular soul. One page of this invisible contract is now being written under our eyes, sealed in confidence and love under the pressure of common trials.

The war at the same time permits the hierarchy to exercise its beneficent mission upon a vaster field. In the still peaceful towns, the bishop has taken a place in all the *comités de secour*, wherever his moral authority appeared necessary to recruit and organize the forces of charity. But it is above all in the invaded or menaced cities that the part of the pastors has been fully developed. Alongside the civil powers, and sometimes in their place, we have seen the Archpriests of Noyon and Vitry, the Bishops of Arras, of Meaux, and other sees, to say nothing of noble Belgians, take up as in the time of the Barbarians their traditional function of *defensor civitatis*. To treat with the victorious enemy, to console the crushed population, and to help in its misfortunes, no voice has been more authoritative, no action more efficacious.

It is in critical moments that the forces of a nation reveal themselves, just as a sickness brings to light the resources of the organism. Without doubt France has never undergone so terrible a shock. Now, in spite of a series of official ostracisms, the Church has come forth, no

less than at other times, as a social power of the first order. It is beyond doubt that this fact, everywhere deeply felt, serves to cement the most indissoluble bonds between people and pastor.

But here again the attentive observer will recognize only the new manifestation of a situation already in existence. The Catholic is placed by his normal religious life in constant relation with his priests and his bishop. If we except the political field, where, by a certain doubling of personality, the conscience of the voters does not ordinarily consider itself bound, never has any group of the laity shown greater deference to the person of its chiefs, or more docility to their orders.

Let it suffice to recall what a terrible experience was the Separation. Some pessimistic spirits predicted the most dire catastrophes. Everyone knew that the discipline of the Catholic people was unanimous and perfect: it has not been belied since the first day. No more has its charity ever wearied. In spite of the novelty of a duty which had not been habitual to them for centuries, the Catholics have been able every year to make up the forty millions of the Budget of Public Worship, and the enterprises already existing have not suffered by this new charge. "The faith which is expressed by permanent sacrifices," says the Abbé de Broglie, "may be considered as sincere."[12] By this criterion we may judge the attachment which France bore to its Church; after the lesson of actual events this sentiment will only be stronger and more enlightened.

Beyond the national frontiers, in the world-enlightening rays of the Eternal City, rises the Papacy. Amid the first convulsions of the War, France followed with troubled attention the last days of Pope Pius X, and M. Hanotaux glanced at the mission reserved for his successor.

"The future pontiff will have an immense part to play, since, when the time comes for peace, he will speak in the name of peace. The slow and laborious conferences which, in the seventeenth century,

[12] *Le présent et l'avenir du catholicisme en France*, p. 23.

issued in the Treaties of Westphalia were presided over by the Legates of the Holy See. . . . May we not think that it may be the same at that moment when arms will fall from men's hands, after a war in which violence of every kind will rapidly precipitate inexpressible exhaustion?"

In the meantime the new Pope is applying himself to lessen the ravages of the scourge. We know of the diplomatic initiative of His Holiness Benedict XV with the belligerent States for the solicitation of an exchange of invalid soldiers and the liberation of civilian prisoners. It could not be a matter of indifference to anyone that for obtaining these measures of broad humanity only the Vicar of Christ could have had sufficient authority. As in the Middle Ages, the voice of the Pope dominates the tumult of arms because it comes from on high. And France is not insensible to this resumption of long-past history: the *Bulletin des armées* emphasized the death of Pius X and saluted courteously the accession of Benedict XV.

We should be very much mistaken if we did not see in all this anything but the play of human influences and the happy success of political combinations. Whether it is a question of the Pope, of the Bishops, or of a simple priest, the man and the minister of God are inseparable. It is in their supernatural character that we must look for the secret of their activity; it is to this divine source that their beneficent action finally brings those who reap the profit of it. By means of the hierarchy of the Catholic priesthood it is the Church that incessantly acts in the world to circulate in it the leaven of the Gospel and the very life of God.

Even in our days, though too many men misunderstand it, Jesus has not ceased to be the Way, the Truth and the Life. The most striking or most remarked example of the higher moral life which the Christian faith inspires in believers and in its representatives will certainly bring back many of our contemporaries to this fundamental law of the spiritual world. Enlightened by their own experience in these tragic times, they too will come to the Son of God to look for "the words of eternal life." Nations

have needs no less than individuals, and they have not different duties. *Pro aris et focis* was always the formula of patriotism. In the light of the war many will begin to recognize the incomparable value of the Catholic religion as an agent of social cohesion, as a source of strength and sacrifice. While some disinterested hearts are asking themselves to what altars of their country they can carry their sacrifices and their prayers, the old faith keeps its mysterious attraction. Barrès, describing a military Mass, tells how he felt "the sensation of a great solitude, and yet that of a communion with every one of those present, or at least with what there was in common to us all and what was beyond us."[13] Without stopping at this vague religiosity of the poet, a number of honest souls will frankly go to the Church which still keeps "the promises of the present life no less than of the future life."

The same pre-occupations do not bring us to the international questions. In the dramatic question of the East, M. Hanotaux perceives "the great moral and religious problem which agitates the world, the struggle or conciliation between Asiatic monotheism . . . and the broad human doctrine of Christianity."[14] And if the law of nations is ever to triumph over force, if a stable peace is to be established among nations, who is there but feels that the Church alone is capable of realizing that triumph?

On learning of the destruction of the cathedral of Rheims, all the French trembled with sorrow, as if the blow had struck the house of their mother. In this spontaneous emotion we may see the symbol of their sentiment towards the Church and through the Church towards God. It is with the faith as with terrestrial friendships; and misfortune, if it does not create them, reveals them and furnishes them with additional aliment. That is why the religious and Catholic awakening of our country affords us the most reasonable grounds for hope.

[13] *Echo de Paris*, 15 December, 1914.
[14] *Op cit.*, page 175.

The Anglican Communion and Christian Unity

By H. K. Archdall,
Fellow and Lecturer, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Dean Designate of Newcastle, New South Wales.

Particular practical exigencies are forcing upon our attention the need and the problem of Christian Unity. He would be a shallow observer, however, who thought that the present growing movement towards Unity is but a utilitarian movement for a more efficient practical policy. It is clear to most people that a Unity which did not bring with it a distinct revival of religion, which did not obviously come from God, would but take us from a one-sided individualism to a solidarity whose principles would be neither sought out nor understood.

It has been recently demanded that the Anglican Communion should make an effort to understand and express the principles for which she stands as a part of Christendom. However meagre the attainments of that body may or may not be, there is no gainsaying the fact that she stands in ideal for an attempt to unite the truth in the Catholic and the Protestant traditions. Therefore the problem of this article intimately concerns the future welfare of the whole of Christendom, and her impact on non-Christian countries.

The present writer, born and educated as a member of the Anglican Communion in Australia, can never allow himself to be detached from the urgency of the wider ideal by any question of merely local importance in England, as *e.g.*, the National Establishment. Whatever changes might be possible and advisable in the

present Establishment in England, there is no doubt that a true answer to that problem will be largely obtained through the wider survey. Moreover such a wider consideration takes us beyond even the surmounting of the antithesis between Catholicism and Protestantism as they exist at present.

That antithesis itself arose in history after the beginning of the movement towards modern science and philosophy, and it would involve a strange degree of scepticism to affirm that general history since the Renaissance has no message of permanent import for the reconstruction of the Christian religion in the future. To desire to ascertain this permanent message and synthesize it with the Christian life and thought of the primitive and mediaeval centuries is no mere "easy broad-churchism". It is one of the things that most needs doing if the Church is to be a living Church dealing with living questions and not merely "the complaisant train-bearer of the ages", speaking in language foreign to the present and promulgating her policy in view of a situation now defunct.

For evidence of this we have but to look at the fact that both Catholicism and Protestantism carry within themselves the danger of inner disruption. Ecclesiastical Catholicism has never been quite pleased with Catholic Mysticism. The general movement of Modernism, whatever its deficiencies, bespeaks a demand for more mobility and open-mindedness to new truth. In Protestantism there has been from the first the now growing antithesis between the Conservatives and the Liberals. The former either interpret the doctrine of biblical inspiration as verbal infallibility or they use the Bible as the only symbolical medium of spiritual life. The latter school in reaction from this biblical position attempts to keep abreast with modern knowledge but shows a tendency to be content with a "reduced Christianity", a thoroughly unscientific procedure.

Despite all these confusions and cross-currents, there still operates within the Christian Church "in various ways and in divers manners" the redemptive message of the imparted life of Christ. It seems futile to hold that the present widespread outward neglect of the Church is any sign that a lasting modern synthesis is going to be reared outside of or in neglect of historical Christianity. The merely modern point of view has as little chance of survival as the merely mediaeval or the merely primitive.

Therefore to look for a synthesis of these three periods of Christian history seems the necessary prerequisite to any approach to Christian unity. It must be recognized that the policy of ignoring any of those periods will lead, and has already led, to premature or shallow syntheses. It is sometimes said that the Anglican Communion appeals to primitive history. We now see the ambiguity in this statement. If the appeal be to the faith and love and hope of the early centuries, it is an appeal which every Christian individual and society must make continually on pain of spiritual extinction. If however we are to draw our theological statements and perspective, or the details of our Church polity altogether from that period, the question is, at what point are we to stop? What right have we to stop at any point? It would seem to be a mere matter of prejudice to pour scorn on mediaeval life and thought, to fail to see greatness underlying abuse. On the other hand, it is surely lacking in insight and courage to be so obsessed with the Middle Ages as an ideal as to direct all efforts towards a "counter-reformation". No negative programme or easy solution of this nature can possibly be by itself an adequate answer to the march of history in the modern period. History both secular and sacred since the Reformation forms part of the field of enquiry whence the will of God for us at present must be sought. So with the modern period. The so-called

"modern man" who impatiently declares what he can and what he cannot believe is in danger in these days of becoming a "*vox et praeterea nihil*". It also seems to be growing increasingly clear that those churches, whose reformation sundered them abruptly from previous history are faced with apparently unsolvable antitheses. Merely to fly from the dangers of the Middle Ages may very well result in an inability to find a constructive answer in the present. It is more than remarkable that the younger men in English Non-conformity are ceasing to lay their whole emphasis on the relatively small or merely negative questions, on the basis of which their separation from the Church of England took place. There is being shown an increasing desire to assimilate all that is best in past Christian history and to think out afresh in modern language the fundamental verities of the Christian faith.

We conclude, in general, that the cause of truth and not merely that of compromise, will be best served in the present day by those who work their way back through the Christian centuries and strive to unite together in a synthetic reconstruction what is abiding and substantial in the three periods of church history; in particular the Anglican Communion will give expression in the providence of God, to the fulness of her distinctive message, if she find grace to effect a real unity of the corresponding points of view, which are in danger in the present day of remaining side by side and only externally related. If history is in God's hands and if the various schools of thought are scrupulously faithful to religious truth rather than party, we will yet be a Church, in actuality and not merely in ideal and thus form a rallying point for the unity of the future. But if the protagonists of each point of view rush blindly forward, and claim that both the general trend and the details of their own system are the whole truth, which everyone must accept, nothing but some disaster awaits us. But

this movement towards a higher truth will only cease to be one of impossible compromise and mediocrity, if we can gain, through our study of the laws of religious history and the growth of Christian truth, crucial principles which may enable us at once to differentiate substantial from accidental in our particular point of view, and gradually to win the vision of, and then express, the higher inclusive truth which is to be the rallying point for the future.

Before making an attempt to consider some such principles, it is well to point out the distinction between general principles, and any particular authoritative declarations as, *e.g.*, the Lambeth Quadrilateral, or any particular set of circumstances of a temporary nature in which certain concessions may be justified. Authoritative declarations of their very nature must be plain statements of fact or injunction without qualifications. The medium of thought and life in which they are interpretable, and through which they *should* come to expression, is perhaps describable as the Christian consciousness of the whole Church at the time. To this consciousness all explicit declarations are referable and in the light of this consciousness alone are they intelligible and authoritative. Again, there is the distinction between principles and the gradual process of their expression in actual affairs. According to some philosophies, principles and facts are always complementary in actual history, and always appear together so as to fit with each other and make growth regular and organic. But it is becoming increasingly evident that, though in the ideal world "the real is rational and the rational is real", our actual world does not *of itself* correspond to this description. For all that, it must be our continuous aim to come by historical progress of this kind; and in so far as Christianity is being worked into the texture of man's history, this will always obtain. On the other hand, when matters have become not only complex but

confused, as they are at present in the Church of Christ, principles can only be realized gradually. Under these circumstances, provided there is a genuine movement in the direction of Christian unity, temporary concessions can be and ought to be made both in order to establish on a firmer basis the spiritual desire for unity, and to bring into clearer light the principles not yet commonly recognized. But it must be quite clear that the movement towards unity is the expression of a common spiritual impulse and not a mere practical expedient, the fulfilment of which might mean more things done, but not necessarily a deeper spiritual life. If the Church can command a sufficient degree of real spiritual insight, the discernment of this difference will be quite sure. If the movement towards unity prove to be mainly utilitarian, the fact of actual disunion should be used by everyone as disciplinary penance.

The growth of insight into this delicate difference will be conditioned largely by the clearness of perception of the principles at work in church history. What then of the general principles which seem to emerge as crucial in church history? In the first place, there is the immense problem of the relation of the Eternal and the Absolute in Christianity to historical facts and processes. It is a truism to assert that Christianity is an historical religion, but it is just as obvious a necessity to affirm that it is the uniting of man with the eternal God. Our religion is God's truth and therefore Absolute and Eternal; yet in any of its historical manifestations it is not and cannot be absolute. Jesus Christ never held that the whole of God's truth *could come to expression* in the series of teachings and events of His short earthly career. That the whole of God's truth existed in His eternal self-consciousness is implied in the fact that He claimed to be Messiah, Saviour and Lord, as distinct from Prophet. Yet the eternal fact that *was* in Him could only come to gradual expression

in history. Our Lord was straitened till the days of His death and resurrection. The Church has always been in ideal the filling up of the expression of that Christ who "all in all is being fulfilled" (Eph. 1:23). Therefore we say that at most the *history* of the Church could be effectively symbolical of the eternal truth of Christ. It must not be identified with that truth; neither must the relation be one of exclusion. It is not enough to reply that Christ and His Church are one transcendentally or *sub specie eternitatis*. The question remains as to how we are to come to realize this fact in a process of knowledge which is temporally conditioned. This process of knowledge *sub specie temporis* begins with a use of external phenomena or events. Then arises a spiritual insight into their meaning and value. But more and more the logical, as distinct from the temporal order, supervenes, and the outward, while remaining of vital significance as bound up with the absolute values, has less and less *direct* attention paid to it, until the outward, from being practically the equivalent of the inward, becomes its symbol and sacrament. If this analysis be correct, the possibility of spiritual progress in the Church lies in the arising of the power to make the chasm between the inner and the outer as sharp as possible, combined with the insight that this attitude alone makes the outward more than a mere decoration of life, and transforms it till it becomes spiritually near and absolutely necessary to us.

It comes to this, that to make the historical and the outward into the only cause of spiritual religion is to go along a road which leads both philosophically and practically to naturalism. Of course no section of the Church has ever held this position theoretically. But wherever the tendency to the magical or to the elimination of the ethical shows itself, wherever there is inability to distinguish between, while uniting God and His gifts, wherever the historical and the outward are

thought of as constituting more than the "permanent possibility" of spiritual life, there this naturalistic tendency is at work and must be fought against in the interests of truth.

But "*abusus non tollit usum*". To fly off to the pietistic solution of the difficulty, which consists in giving up everything which is "dangerous", will be equally disastrous in another direction. It is a sad thing that the human mind so easily imagines that one exaggeration can be cured by another. Now it is not merely natural but right that reformations should happen, when the use of the historical and the outward is not merely sacramental of ethical and spiritual life, but is turned into mumbling magic or empty aesthetic sentiment. The world-renouncing element in our religion is its primary and fundamental feature, and occasions may arise when, in order "to enter into life", the fulness of the complementary world-affirmation has to be reduced; but this will always be a maimed spirituality which must only be acquiesced in temporarily. If an attempt is made to regard such a situation as permanent, spiritual life in attempting to escape dangers will lose all content. Christ's religion can never be unnatural for long, and to try to neglect the historical and the outward proves itself sooner or later non-human. So negative an outlook could never spiritualize other organized complexes of life, such as Society, Art, Politics, Work—complexes so much in evidence in modern life, as spheres in which men live and feel after God.[1]

Nowadays, however, the purely pietistic point of view has given way to a larger and more generous outlook. It is said that the spiritual experience of God, when it is obtained, is *in its essence* the same in all Christians and in all Christian communities, however diverse may be their use of the historical side of Christianity and of the outward elements of organized religion. Therefore,

[1]Compare Von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, p. 329.

since all these additional elements which divide us are non-essential, let us make forthwith an amalgam of Christian forces and trust to the future to fit modes of devotion and use of the historical and outward into their proper place. This is an observable tendency of thought and life and it certainly contains a kernel of truth, sadly neglected in the past. But as the whole truth it oversteps itself. An appeal to the essence of Christian experience is an appeal to the unifying ideal of Heaven. It gives inspiration rather than practical guidance in our present situation, conditioned as this is by distinctive dependence upon and evaluation of the historical and the outward. It is true that far more effort should be made to understand in common fellowship the one goal which draws all Christians together, but as soon as we begin to ask what form such fellowship should take, we are reminded that the question is still on our hands, *viz.*, what is the relative value, in the long run and on the whole, of divergent means of promoting apprehension of the absolute essence of Christianity?

We have seen that a proper use of the historical and the outward is vital to a healthy Christianity. How are we to decide as to this proper use in the face of the dual danger of identifying or severing the outward and the inward, the historical and the eternal?

The only safe way of even approaching the question is to be ready for every danger, so far as God's grace enables us. The attempt must be made to profit from all the advantages which come to the Christian religion from its historical beginning and its tradition of thought, worship and order, while laying plans to obviate the disadvantages which a false use of these potentialities has clearly brought. But is each one of us to make this attempt on the basis of the insight which each possesses at the present moment? Must we not recognize that, though the individual only sees at any moment what he does see, his power of seeing is greatly conditioned

by a tradition of some sort. There is a tragedy opening up before our eyes. At the moment that pioneers in the world of thought are telling us that all concrete knowledge and, in particular, all spiritual knowledge grows, not primarily through a recognition of abstract notions, or through the excogitation of detached individuals, but through the unification of all the functions of our personality in the give and take of historical social life, at that very moment educated Europe is impatiently swinging free from tradition even in the form of discipline. Protests against the particular form which institutions have taken in the past, or weariness at the difficulties thus left on our hands should not induce us to glide easily over this fundamental truth. Here Catholicism and Orthodox Protestantism join hands against an eighteenth century individualism, which mistakes the actual for the ideal. It is not *less* loyalty to a Church that we need, but *more*. If we could really agree on this point, we might pursue with profit the question, what Church?

It would be too much to say that all Christians recognize the depth of the influence which life in the fellowship of a Church exerts, in conditioning our power to make valid judgments on religious matters in general. The objective study not only of church history but also of social psychology reveals certain general laws of human growth, which apply to religious as to all life.

"Nowhere can men exist alongside of each other with merely parallel feelings and thoughts; but thousandfold relations subsist between individual men; and out of these relations there everywhere arise social circles, which require super-ordinations and sub-ordinations of its members, and which all require a concrete centre."[2]

This over-individual nature of life in a society conditions men's capacities for right judgment, a truth surely which is especially applicable to the case of the Christian Church, where Christ is the "centre" of the

[2]Quoted from Troeltsch by Von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, p. 326.

community and where life in the body forms or should form part of the redemptive life of Christ.

Again, social psychology is at work in the various complexes of life, such as Art, Science, Ethics. Do we all agree that the spiritualization of these various complexes is only possible through the Christian society? Is it not a fact that many hold the view that the way to spread Christianity in these organizations of life is to make Christians of individuals in a religious life which is as free as possible from all points of contact with these complexes of life and with the laws of psychology at work in them? Then the problem arises as to how those individuals are to be able to spread their faith in these very complexes they have been taught to ignore. The truth is that such a policy breaks down all points of contact between religion and daily life, and must tend to make religion unhealthy.

Finally, social psychology tells us of the naturalness and the necessity of outward signs when used in the intention of the members of a society to remind them of the duty of loyalty and to impress upon all the sacredness and the authority of the end for which the society exists. There can be symbols of word, of action, of thing, or of person. In all healthy societies these various symbols operate together in due perspective. The first gives the element of thought. The ethical and aesthetical symbols should be complementary in their growth and their application; otherwise the aesthetical symbols lose their appeal and suggestiveness, and become a mere matter of useless decoration. Persons may also exercise a powerful representative function, when duly appointed for that purpose. The variations in this type of symbolism depend upon the degree of permanence of the representative function. Whenever the individual or class exercising the representative function mistakes representative power for personal merit, and begins to "lord it over" the other members of the society in virtue

of his own whim and pleasure, a dualism is set up in the society and there follows the inevitable revolution. The application of this to the question of Clergy and Laity in the Church is obvious. In general, the suggestive and inspirational power of symbols is seen in the spread of a spirit of loyalty and the preservation of an atmosphere of spirituality in which loyal devotion and direct faith become easier. This power can be observed, not so much in individual cases as in the movements of history in the large. In fact, the stability and effectiveness of any society depends on the nature of those symbols of its fundamental *raison d'être* which it is able to utilize effectively. They should represent as far as possible, the various ends and stages of growth of the society; and they should make these re-live in the imagination and life of the members. If the society is untrue to its end, its symbols will become dead excrescences. If the decadence is not complete but temporary, it will be wise to keep as many of the crucial symbols as possible in order to have to hand rallying points for further revivals. Needless destruction of these interpretative symbols would be an act of vandalism.

Two objections might be made at this stage to the application of analogical arguments from social psychology to the Christian Church. It might be said that Christianity is a supernatural religion, a religion of God's grace and is not therefore *in pari materia.* The reply must be sufficient that Grace is the complement not the contradiction of Nature. The contrary view rests ultimately on a doctrine of the total corruption of human nature. Again, it might be claimed that social psychology is only applicable to the infancy of the race. This is a cruel evasion. The lessons of childhood have to be continually re-learnt in ordinary circumstances; and the present Church does not seem to have learnt her lesson very effectively, if one may judge from the present industrial situation, which was

allowed to grow up with little or no protest from the Church.

We seem therefore forced to the conclusion that life in a society goes a long way to constitute personality and that this law is operative even more in religion than elsewhere.

We must now attempt to deal at closer quarters with the specific doctrine of the Christian Church. In the first place we must distinguish between the ideal Church which is part of the creed, and the Christian community as existent and persistent through the centuries. We can only relate the latter to the former as an asymptotic approach to the ideal. The meaning of the ideal is most clearly set forth in the doctrine of heaven. We picture to ourselves a form of experience in which we can only dimly partake here, a state of life in which love for God and man is one unified process, whose various moments reciprocate one another in the freedom and inevitability of their connection. In the historical Church the approach to this ideal will be continuous only when the distinction between the invisible and the visible Church is operative, *along with* the determination to see the former through and in the latter. It is not a feasible position to claim that the Church, *as she has expressed herself in the past*, was identical at any point with Christ; or, to use the biblical phrase, was actually the Bride adorned for her husband. It *is* tenable to hold that, so far as the historical can mediate this complete knowledge, the history of the Church as a whole is second only to the history of the Gospels, as a medium through which to see the eternal Christ. But it would be a truer position, and one more in keeping with New Testament thought, to assert that the true Church has never existed and does not exist on earth, but at any moment might do so, in a measure quite beyond all past attainment.

All branches of the Church *formally* separate and

unite the visible and the invisible Church, but in actual life the tendency has been to belittle one or the other. Some Protestants have frankly said that we must not expect the invisible to find much expression in this world, and that if we are to try to see the former through and in the latter, it must be only in certain portions of her history arbitrarily chosen. Some Catholics have made a simple identification of the two, thus leading to legalism. But in all really constructive periods "the rich vitality of the Christian conviction has depended as truly on Christians not making an absolute distinction, as upon their not making the simple identification".[3] We reach this principle, therefore, that the outward in thought and life plays its right place in the development of religious knowledge when it is regarded as a permanent condition of religious faith, as a potentiality which has to be continually actualized in the religious intention of the believing individual or community. To think of the outward as something merely given and fixed is to withdraw facts and events from the religious world altogether. This leads to legalism and coercion, while to attempt to ignore such outward factors is to pursue an inhuman, chaotic, and spurious spirituality.

Let us attempt to illustrate this principle in the two spheres of thought and order.

With reference to the problem of thought and church authority, it is no longer any use to depend on a coercive authority. The idea of a test of truth is really fallacious. We do not need and we cannot have anything more ultimate than the apprehension of truth, by means of which we might externally test that apprehension. We can have and we do need a *guide* to truth, *e.g.*, we can be guided by the consideration that our view should be inwardly coherent and should make sense of as great a range of experience as possible. With reference to Christianity in particular, its truth shines by its own

[3]Von Hügel, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

light. The one thing that remains the same at all times is the spiritual transformation of the lives of the saints through the Christian revelation. Many think this indefinite: but it is really the similarity of the reports, which travellers to the "land which is very far off" bring back with them, that is the abiding kernel of our religion. The attainment of this life for Christians as a whole can be conditioned by the guidance of an intellectual, moral and ecclesiastical authority. It will not be helped but rather hindered by coercion. The function of intellectual authority in the Church is not to prevent full enquiry and thought, but to register the valid conclusions of past days, and to see that time is not wasted unnecessarily by ignoring results already attained. But if all we are to do is to accept a given set of intellectual propositions, without trying to appreciate their intellectual as well as spiritual foundations, our intellect ceases to be a means towards the apprehension of God's truth. It is worse still, if such a set of propositions is viewed as a block whole, every item of which is of equal importance. Such a view leads to a nervous demand for infallibility in particular declarations or in spheres where it can never be had and generally accompanies the strange notion that intellectual propositions which are doubtful may be rendered indubitable by an authority, however impressive, which yet does not produce evidence to the point. Questions of fact and questions of thought can but be settled by the means available in any age for the furtherance of those studies, and if scientific or philosophical tools become sharpened, we should expect progress in restatement. If the Church is not able to plead altogether not guilty to the charge of theological coercive pressure in scientific or philosophical questions in the past, only a true view of authority in this matter will prevent the recurrence of such disaster in the future. If the claim for Christian theology be that it is an asymptotic approach to absolute truth, then that theology

may be criticizable in details and in its perspective, without lessening its authority. The readjustment, which was impossible on the old rationalistic idea of Christian truth, will become quite possible when the organic conception of its growth has really been assimilated. This conviction that our knowledge of religion grows rather than is proved *ab extra* will produce the insight necessary for the discrimination between the really progressive and the temporarily popular elements in modern thought; while the scientific temper of our time will respond to the reasonableness of the demand that no individual or age has a right to a self-dependent opinion on theological matters, unless those opinions have been attained after a sympathetic study of the concrete life and thought of the past. Furthermore, a coercive authority will not be demanded, if the Church's growth is really organic. Under these circumstances, she would shed by a process of natural repulsion that which is really repugnant to her deepest life.

At times of change the normative factor is the Christian attitude to life as a whole. Judgments given in the light of this insight are more likely to serve the truth, than a rigid application of formularies, which are patent of differing interpretations. Occasionally a condemnation may be made on the ground of the denial of a formulary, but the condemnation must always spring primarily from the failure of the condemned person to hold the essentially Christian view of life. This would mean that the decision of exclusion must come from the common Christian consciousness of the time which comes to expression through its accredited and qualified representatives. Such an appeal could only be trusted if the Church had a living system of lay as well as clerical representation, in other words the representatives must really represent. There must be an adequate balancing of the centralizing and decentralizing forces in the Church; otherwise revolution would follow on the

steps of despotism, and all possibility of genuine organic progress would be postponed.

Little need be said of those who flee from the difficulties of theological statements, even when used as disciplinary guides. Such a course of action despairs of the human intellect, and generally produces by reaction what it sought to avoid, *viz.*, a barren intellectualism, to say nothing of a total lack of perspective.

We pass now to consider an illustration of our general principles in the question of the function of the outward in the promotion of Christian spiritual life, in particular the problem of order. In the first place, no answer to this question can be gained by any theory of the institution of the Church by our Lord. It is clearly an unhistorical procedure to suppose detailed instructions from Christ without definite evidence to that effect. But it must be stated that His teaching does contain general spiritual principles. The writer believes that the above statement of such principles is in general accord with the religious teaching of the gospels; at least he hopes so. Our Lord's teaching on the question of order would seem to be able to be summed up in the two verses taken together, *viz.*, "He that is not against us is for us", and "He that is not with me is against me and He that gathereth not with me scattereth". It is the union of these two thoughts which is really at the back of all our previous discussion.

A caveat must be entered before we go further. Endless appeals are made to happenings in various parts of our Church's history in order to prove what *is at present* the attitude of the Anglican communion on some point, whereas all that the complex past can do for us is to guide us in making up our minds in the twentieth century as to what we must do. The question of order is not primarily a matter of antiquarian interest at all, but rather of the working of general laws of spiritual growth. If the Church is a

live Church, it is beside the point to conclude from a selection of past events that the Anglican communion is "one of the Protestant Churches" or from certain other events or teachings that she is part of the Catholic Church of all ages, or that she really teaches doctrine indistinguishable from that of the Council of Trent. The history of our Church is so interwoven with the whole complex history of Christendom that the call is not for the raising of a merely negative or blindly traditional standard; rather the whole modern situation calls for courage to make up our minds afresh as to what, in view of all our past and present sufficiencies and insufficiencies, the Anglican communion as part of organized Christianity is to be in the future, especially with reference to the hope of Unity.

It is best to centre our attention on one particular of order and worship in this connection. Perhaps Episcopacy will serve our purpose best.

Episcopacy came to be recognized, at an early date, as sacramental of the unity and continuity of the Church. When wisely handled this accomplished fact has acted as an element of wise conservatism, without being repressive of individual or local spontaneity. Moreover this order, having developed by consent, and not by constraint, seems eminently fitted to form a rallying point for future unity. Of course, there have been in most centuries of the Church's history various protests against the misuse of episcopal authority. Premature alliance with the world has produced the prince-bishop. Failure to appreciate the due value and significance of nationalism has given rise to ultra-montanism. Unwarrantable autocracy in doctrine and discipline has brought stagnation or revolt. Protests against these abuses have taken the form of reformation or revolution, the distinction between these two attitudes being that while both appeal to the ideal which has been contradicted, in the former case, truth is recognized as underlying

abuse and it is regarded as being important to keep as many points of contact as possible in order to facilitate future reunion. In the latter case the past seems so hopeless, that an appeal to the ideal is accompanied by giving up all points of contact with institutions which have been misused. With reference to the question of episcopacy, the Anglican Church has made it quite clear that her reformation was not a revolution. On the whole her attitude has been that it would be unnecessary recklessness to cast away, because of its abuse, an order which has been all along the chief order recognized and used by the vast majority of Christians, and which seems destined to be the future rallying point for outward unity. There is nothing to show that this attitude should be or will be altered. But this is not to draw the uncharitable and sinful conclusion that non-episcopalians are outside the Church altogether. Even if episcopacy is one most important vital element in the visible Church, we cannot say that those who do not submit to this order are outside either the invisible or the visible Church. Clearly the works of the Spirit testify to membership in the invisible Church; and if any of the external marks of the visible Church, be they in matters of order or practical activity for righteousness, are consciously used as sacramental of the unity and continuity of the Church, those who so use them must be inside the visible Church in some sense. Therefore, we must take exception to the gnosticism which allows that non-episcopalians, both as individuals and as communities, have part in the "soul of the Church" but not in her body. It might well be that non-episcopal Churches could develop to a high degree of adequacy other external features of the true Church's life, as *e.g.* representative synods as part of the upward or democratic element of church life, and cause to be recognized to a remarkable extent the "priesthood of the laity".

But on the other hand there is no doubt that the

non-episcopal bodies do not tend to develop such a sense of the givenness of Christian truth, or such an idea of a new order which creates its members, as tends to be the case under episcopal government. This "given" or transcendent element is the fundamental thing in Christianity, and episcopacy does stand as "a reflection of the transcendent authority of Christ". Some theologians, discounting the significance of such a symbol, take refuge in a distinction between episcopacy being not of the *esse* but of the *bene esse* of the Church. Now if this distinction means anything more than that forms of government or outward order are not in themselves the essential thing in Christianity (*i.e.* are not themselves identical with the ideal Church), it seems to the writer a mere subterfuge. Granted that these outward things are not of no value in the development of spiritual religion, then we can not be content with anything less than the best. What is beneficial to the Church must be essential to her growth. The policy of being content with anything less than the best would stultify all high effort, and even as to practical policy, we would be left with no possibility of anything but a chaotic procedure. We conclude therefore that we must cling to the *fait accompli* of episcopacy as a matter of principle, because, when freed from abuses, it tends both to accompany a natural use of the laws of social psychology as shown in the development of the Church, and to keep before the minds of all Christians the unitary nature and the transcendent source of Christian truth. It follows that whenever there is a real movement towards the joint fulfilment of these two tendencies in the non-episcopal bodies, we can be sure that there will arise, with the desire for stable institutionalism, a readiness to embrace episcopacy, especially if it be shown that this order involves neither prelacy nor autocracy.

But we of the Anglican communion must win anew the possibility of a diversity in unity which is organic.

There must be no idea of an absorption of the non-episcopalians which would imply that we have nothing to learn. We are on the verge of learning this lesson, and of getting rid of our fatal stiffness and respectability. We must learn to be ready to apologize, always a hard thing for Englishmen. Then we can begin to make the approach to reunion and the actual step as natural as possible; it may not always be beneficial to meet a desire for the reparation of past mistakes with a stiffness which might imply even undesignedly that we had nothing to be penitent for. It is before all things necessary that an atmosphere of mutual understanding and appreciation be created by that degree of fellowship in prayer and work, which becomes possible or advisable. These possibilities will vary with place and circumstance, but must be eagerly watched for and seized. United ethical effort should have become more common long ago. The method of interdenominational as distinct from undenominational fellowship, where prayer is the chief note, would do much by its interchange of points of view in a non-controversial atmosphere. Still further, a readiness to search together for a fuller realization of the absolute element in Christianity need bring no lessening of existing loyalties of thought and order, if there is always a frank recognition of and respect for differences. Such a method would create an increased power of feeling (and not merely of admitting) the permanent good in other people and systems; it would break down barriers of mere custom or caste, and at the same time would bring to a true antithesis the vital points of difference. This method of fellowship, if faithfully pursued, would tend to unite, in proportion as a common vision of the absolute element in our religion is won; and so far from producing a readiness to be content with a utilitarian amalgam of forces, would throw into clearer relief the abiding differences. The whole matter would be raised on to a higher plane out of the region of proselytizing,

and when men hate to differ, the impulse towards unifying truth will bring at once courage, hope, and humility. The acceptance of episcopacy would take place only when the impulse of a spiritual revival was coming to expression in both episcopal and non-episcopal communities. Under the power of this impulse, action might become possible which were otherwise never thought of. There would be a readiness to give and, if non-episcopalians asked for it, to accept conditional ordination. A courageous attachment to episcopacy might be combined with a humility, which would show the world that it is no pride of place that is sought but Christian unity. I do not however anticipate that the desire for such mutual conditional ordination would be felt.

With regard to the complementary question of our relations to the Roman and the Greek Catholic Churches, and the reformed Churches of the continent, it must be remembered that the movement to this larger reunion must be prepared for, even though immediate action on any large scale seems impossible. Nothing must be done which will make that future consummation more difficult. Generally speaking, our task at present is to rid ourselves of the false element in our insularity; to vindicate our position as an integral part of the Church of all ages and that in spirituality and missionary spirit as well as in order; to so work the valid elements in the protests of Protestantism into our actual life that we will find a synthesis with the abiding truth of Catholicism both necessary and possible; to work in short for a reformed and liberalized Catholicism. We must reckon on movements of a constructive nature taking place in the Roman and Greek communions as well as in the reformed continental Churches. In England we have been largely free from the peculiar relations which exist between Catholicism and Protestantism on the continent, and it seems clear that we must engage in no movements with either side which would prejudice our ap-

proach to the other, or the common approach of us all to each other. In particular, it is no use to pretend that the English reformation settlement was the same as the continental reformation generally. Though we are with all Protestants in protesting against abuses, and the autocratic centralization of power in the hands of the Papacy,[4] we are not with them in their attempt to swing loose of church history before the reformation. It is more than remarkable that some of the most eminent religious philosophers are beginning to see the irrationality of cutting history in two at the reformation and there is much to be said for the view that pure Protestantism will not be able to find its way through the mazes of modern thought, or overcome the antitheses of intellectualism and sentimentalism, under which it is labouring, until it reabsorbs some of the distinctively Catholic elements into its religious system. Prominent among those elements is the doctrine of the Church.[5]

We of the Anglican Communion must profit from the experience of pure Protestantism in this matter and in making this attempt we must never think that it is possible to excogitate a religion as one excogitates a system of education. Living our life within the warmth of the fullest tradition we can grasp, we will not seek to believe as little as possible, neither will we be credulous. We do not want a liberalism which takes the edge off all the main Christian doctrines; we do want a liberalism which, starting from *within* the Christian life and tradition which has produced the traditional theology and mode of life, is quite willing to amend that theology and mode of life in any way demanded by the genuine insight of the modern period. Mere mediaevalism we can never return to on any large scale. Finally we must strive really to unite the ideals of freedom and order,

[4]cp. the Roman Catholic theologian, Von Hügel: *Eternal Life*, pp. 358, 359.

[5]cp. in different ways Troeltsch, Royce, Eucken.

of inspiration and discipline, which always tend to fall asunder so terribly when spiritual life is not deep and broad at once.

Those who believe in the absoluteness of the Christian religion will not be dismayed at the difficult demands of a task of this greatness; they will lay their plans for and build their prayerful hopes on the appearance of a liberalized Catholicism which will give new vigour to the present European lassitude in religious matters. The Anglican communion, by her touch with the complex past, and her openness of mind to new truth, may play no small part in bringing this about. It is true that our ideals seem out of all proportion to our attainments. This we can but regard as God's call to our penitence, courage, wisdom, and, above all, religious insight.

Christianity After the War

By Newman Smyth, D.D.

The real test of Christianity is to come after the war. Often it has been so in history; after war a greater work of faith has been done in Christ's name. Because wars must needs come to pass, the Christ does not fail; a new era opens for Christianity. It was so at the first when Jesus himself foretold to the disciples the inevitable war in which their own Holy City should be destroyed: after that the Apostolic Church went forth with a new Gospel for the Roman world. It was so when Constantine's prolonged and sanguinary war had made him victorious ruler of the Roman Empire: after that Christianity, its age of persecution passed, found confronting it the vast task of making the whole known world Christian. Again it was so after the cruel wars of the Reformation; liberty, when won, put the peoples to the test of ruling themselves with toleration and in social righteousness. It is then no idle word, it is true to the historical order of progress, to say that this present, greatest war of history shall try as by fire modern Christianity; and, whenever peace shall have been made by the sword, shall put it to the test of the greatest opportunity. The critically hopeful question of this present hour for the Church is—After the war shall there be a new epoch of *International Christianity?*

To prepare for this coming day of judgment for organized Christianity, the American Churches can not begin too soon to mobilize their several forces and to make them ready to act as one power. While the conflict rages and death reigns over vast battlefields, our Government must

keep its neutrality. But the American Churches cannot remain unconcerned and indifferent, when sooner or later the bells that shall ring in a new year of peace shall summon them to go forth and to do their full part throughout the world to make civilization thoroughly and powerfully Christian, as it never yet has been.

We may not assume that national safety or international law can be secured without force. We have science enough to understand that the whole creation rests fundamentally on force; it consists of forces ordered, organized, harmonized, controlled. Radiant energies from the whole stellar universe are met and blended in the peace of a summer evening's sky. And we have our Bible for it that God's love is throned on His omnipotence. The progress of civilization has been made through the moralizing and legalizing of force; and the greater work for the Church of God to undertake anew with all its might is to Christianize the world-powers. As the war compels us to acknowledge that nominally Christian civilization beneath the surface is more pagan than we had fondly thought, all the more imperative and inspiring is the opportunity and the obligation to make international Christianity the prevailing world-power. To some such words may seem vacant of meaning. They will be real and vibrant with intense meanings to those who have had brought home to them the noblest passion and sacrificial courage of the war. For many in the trenches, for others waiting in the homes, the war has put new meaning into life. Peace shall not be made by our peace meetings and all our peace resolutions, as though well sounding words were as brave deeds done, by which alone the blessing of the makers of peace in this stupendous war may be won. But the war should put new meaning into the obligation of American Christianity for the world. It will not be enough for us to sit now in our own snug and safe neutrality, if the Churches of the United States are not preparing to meet the call

of the hour after the war to put forth their whole might to make Christianity the supreme world-power.

In such conviction of the real test to come of our Christianity, and of the momentous issue to be met, it is the aim of this article to bring to the front, and so far as possible to put into the focus of religious attention, this single and paramount question: Is our present disorganized Protestantism prepared, or so much as gathering itself together to make ready, for its full part and effectual working in this coming epoch for Christianity after the war? Or shall the Churches, because divided and powerless to act together, be found wanting in this notable day of the world?

There can be no question as to the need and the opportunity for Christian mediation after the war. The specific forms which it may take, time only can determine; it will tax the resources of the Churches everywhere to meet them. There will be the wounds of the people to be healed; hatreds of the nations to be shot through with radiant sympathies; university friendships, broken in the passion of the hour, to be renewed in the calm of congenial pursuits; the wilderness and the desert left by war to be made to blossom as the rose; in short, the reserves of moral and religious power in all countries must be called to the colours to overcome the causes of war; for until these shall be searched out and destroyed in every people, disarmament by the vanquished in the present strife may prove to be a truce for a time, but not a peace of God which shall come to stay.

There are many just now who are thinking and speaking concerning possible "Leagues of Peace", or combinations of various kinds by means of which hereafter wars may be prevented—all excellent on paper, and possibly to some limited extent not beyond the reach of future international statesmanship. But what nations may thus combine, or, when their own interests are involved, stay combined; how much armament may be acquired for

them to police the world; what their several shares in its maintenance shall be, and how determined;—all such questions would require for their determination much more national unselfishness for the sake of international prosperity and peace than has as yet been exhibited by any country. Moral power only can reduce armament to a minimum. The final security of the world's peace shall be international Christianity. Greater Church Unity is a necessary condition for that.

The United States may or may not have anything to do with making the terms of peace. But the United Churches of the United States will not take their "place in the sun" in the coming age of universal peace, if now they shall fail of making their Christianity at home real and potential enough to become a Christianity for the world. Surely the Christianity of this neutral country, in its citizenship related by ties of blood with all the peoples at war, and in its Churches bound by common traditions and worshipping in many tongues with the various Churches of the old world, may hold the position of a favoured nation for free intercourse and fellowship with the educational and religious communities of these countries of Europe; and no one can predict how varied and influential may be their service, if so be they shall begin first at home to combine their many gifts of tongues, and be found ready to declare their gospel in one spirit and power, whenever peace shall throw wide open the door of opportunity. The heart of the people is ready to respond to the call of these times; but have they leaders who are Church statesmen—men who have prophetic vision, and the will to follow it, ecclesiastical leaders who in this crisis of stupendous consequence for humanity can be broad and high enough to subordinate all lesser values, or divisive Church issues, to the supreme duty of throwing the whole united force of Christianity into the warfare against the causes of war, that a new rule of righteousness and peace may be begun in our day on

earth? It is for the men of influence and leading in the Churches to answer. In their several folds shall they be content to remain good Churchmen, or at any sacrifice shall they become great Christians?

There is one Church that stands always ready. For centuries there has never been a day when it has not had power, for better or for worse, to speak its own mind with authority; and it has led its own following. At any time of need it has not to wait. In the morning its voice may go forth to the ends of the earth. At midnight it may speak; and, as the sun rises the whole world round, the people shall listen. Before the powers of the world it can appeal for millions of people, and in every tongue. It retains no temporal sovereignty; it cannot command the war to stop; yet its appeal has gone forth for the love of Christ's sake in behalf of the sufferers and the prisoners. The Church of Rome has a voice, and it can make it heard even amid the storm of war. The Protestant Churches cannot. The voice of the Roman Church is one voice, as the voice of many waters; there is none to declare the mind of the Protestant Churches, though all would hear it spoken. Its voice is as the murmurs of running brooks from distant sources. Even so, it is better, we say; a spiritual absolutism is a menace against liberty, as a political militarism is a constant threat of war. Do you forget your Protestant history—the conflicts of the Reformation period, the warfare of the creeds, the opposing principles still far from reconciliation, the hopes of reformers within the Roman Church deferred, the vision of the Catholic Church for which many scholars and saints have suffered and died without seeing it fulfilled. Not at all; nor would I fail also to look towards the future and greet the promise of another reformation of the Roman Church from within,—beyond our present horizons, but not beyond God's thought throughout these intervening centuries of our Protestant separation—"God having provided some better thing

concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect." Be these things as they may—our receding memories of embittered strife and our far hopes of some coming day of reconciliation—I am putting all these considerations for the moment out of sight; they are not to the point which the comparison just made brings out. That is the outstanding fact which confronts the Protestant Churches—their independence of one another has left them powerless to act, even when they ought to act together in their power as a whole. They do not, they cannot, stand up as one solid force to confront an impious wrong; they cannot rise at an hour's summons to meet an emergency; nor can they minister as one body for Christ's sake to the urgent suffering of any land. They are not united or even practically federated sufficiently in any city to do the greatest possible good which they have the men and the means, the mind and the heart, to do.

It is to be said that this is the price of their liberty, the inefficiency of their democracy. But the question returns: Is so much inter-church inefficiency really necessary for the maintenance of a free Church democracy? Certainly it has not proved to be so in the history of the State. The development of democracy in the disunited Churches has not kept pace with the development of democracy in the United States. For the history of this country has been a continual movement towards union. An early step was taken in the formation in 1643 of the New England Confederacy, in which the Colonies remained independent states while uniting for common protection. One reason given for this confederation, besides the necessity of mutual defence, was "the sad distraction in England". Thus war led to this first step in Colonial federation. Again possibilities of war were among the reasons for the successive Congresses of the Colonies. And again, it was war that compelled the closer federation of the original thirteen independent

Colonies, and at its end their union under the Federal Constitution. This movement of democracy towards unity reached further consummation when the close of the civil war determined that this country was not to be divided into Confederacies, and brought the North and the South together in the peace and the power of the Nation. Throughout the historical process of the development of national unity, for the welfare of the people as a whole with powers to act as a whole for the purposes of the whole, democracy has not been imperiled, the country has not become less free, the rights of the States have been conserved, and local home rule in towns and cities under diversified forms has not been forfeited. Independent where independence should be maintained, united where union is necessary for the good of the whole, —such is the lesson for our Churches of the political history of the United States. The history of the Churches, on the contrary, has been a movement towards disunity. In a land which has gained its independence through union, American Christianity has remained to this day in a state resembling the unfederated condition of the early Colonial period. Shall it at last come to pass that one result of another war, of which we are spectators, shall be to arouse American Christianity to a consciousness of its vaster possibilities, and in the flames of our sacrifices forge it into a Christian world power, as united as it is free?

This matter will be brought to a clearer issue, if I may speak with definite aim concerning the inter-relations of two influential Churches, purposely excluding for the moment all others solely for the purpose of avoiding generalities and coming to close grip with concrete instances—I refer to the inter-relations of the Protestant Episcopal and Congregational Churches. This specification is the more pertinent because both of these Churches have much in their history in common. By descent they were originally one, though by a past separation they

have been long divided. Beyond their own ecclesiastical enclosures, out in the open, they walk by the same Spirit with one another. Irrespective of differences of convictions, not lightly to be dismissed, concerning certain principles which they would conserve, they are closely affiliated in scholarship and essentially one in faith. Yet between their ministries time has raised a middle wall of partition which, though their prayers fly over it to heaven, little effort on either side is put forth to break down. Many seem to take it for granted that this must continue to be because it has been so long. These two Churches are sending their charity as one gift—under the religiously neutral sign of the Red Cross. But charity is not all of Christianity; their religious faith and hope they do not give together to the world. With all their mutual helpfulness and benevolence, these two Churches lack one thing needful—the one thing most Christian they can not do: according to their canons and customs they can not consecrate, each for the other, the same cup of communion; they do not, and they can not, in one joint act of ordination, commission a missionary to carry the bread of life to China, or send a clergyman in the name of their common discipleship to minister to the wounded and the dying in trench or hospital. They can do almost everything else together; but this one thing which the Lord himself prayed that the disciples might *be*, they have not *become;*—they have not made their unity so visible that the world, seeing it, may believe in their Christ.

This is the plain fact as visible as their church doors, facing each other, which the world, passing by every Lord's day, sees, and seeing does not believe in their Christ. It would be going beyond the fact to say that on either side this separation has been accepted as final. On the contrary, since the breach of Church fellowship occurred among the Churches of the Reformation, the Episcopal Church has offered prayers for the removal of our "unhappy divisions"; while on the part of the Congregational

Churches their longing for reunion has found repeated expression from the earliest declaration of their faith in 1648 to the last utterance of their National Council in 1913. I am only saying that while both have prayed continually for it, neither has willed to do it. They have accepted the easier task of praying for it; they have left undone the further and greater duty of seeking for the answer to their declarations and their prayers until they find it, waiting at the end of their own endeavour to do what the Lord requires of his disciples. The shock of the war may shake us out of our comfortable ecclesiastical complacencies, and compel us to confess the fact of our anti-Christian divisions. To do its work in this coming era Christianity must become dynamically one.

Not to leave this insistence in one of those weak generalities, in which we are prone to dissolve hard duties, I would mention some ways in particular in which the Churches may now press for practice. First of all, is the will to face squarely the existing facts, and at the same time look up and have the vision. To see the fact without also having the vision, avails nothing. Our science should teach us that to reach practical results one must do both. For science has gained its signal advances by finding the facts first; next, in view of the facts, by making an hypothesis—gaining a clear vision of their meaning—and then by returning to the facts, and trying them out in the light of the vision. This is the sure way likewise of moral and religious triumph. Match the fact and the vision. Prove the vision by bringing it straight down to the fact. We are to confront then the known fact of the divisive inefficiency of *our* Christianity in the illuminating vision of the power of Christ's Christianity. To see the present fact only may leave us useless pessimists; to look up and have the vision only will leave us useless dreamers. Seeing the one in the light of the other will send us forth to do things. From above, our practical Christian efforts should be directed; as the guns along the battle line are

not aimed by what is seen from the ground—the airmen, flying above, having larger horizons, look down and enable the gunners to hit the mark. It will be a great gain and a sure advance if religious leaders shall have vision of the Church at once high enough and broad enough to know where in the immediate situation effective action may be attempted.

These things being held true, *viz.*, the compelling occasion resulting from the war, the larger vision, and consequently the paramount obligation of American Christianity to make of its moral and religious forces one dynamic, potential with the Almighty's love for the world: it follows that the thing to do is to begin at once to mobilize these forces at all practical points of concentration. No other conclusion is logical, no less obedience Christian. Here again our political history indicates a way that the Churches may take. After the Civil War the country had to meet the problem of the resumption of specie payment. Many said it could not then be done. But one day the word was spoken: "The way to resume is to resume." The word went round, and the people saw the point. Congress fixed a date to do it, and it was resumed. The way to restore the lost unity of the Church is to restore it. Should a voice from above, out of the peace of Heaven, summon the many Churches to unite in a Holy Alliance at a fixed date—the next day after peace shall be declared, or next Christmas day—they could do it. Their present divisive issues would at once be held subordinate to this great commandment; all "the precious things" of all Churches would be brought in and rendered more precious in the joy and glory of such a Christmas morn. We should wonder what could ever have kept us apart. The Churches have the new commandment, "Love one another"; it is left for us to fix the date.

Recently some practical efforts have been undertaken to bring the Churches into external fellowship at least in their work. Through an organization outside the

Churches, constituted of representatives from them, but independent of them—the so-called Federal Council of Churches—much co-operation has been obtained in various directions. Such promising federation in work is a good beginning of what those most active in it hope may lead to a better ending. It shows that our free and independent Churches in their interdenominational relations have reached at least a development corresponding to the later Colonial period sometime previous to the American Revolution. Our political history has likewise something to teach concerning the method by which a more internal and efficient union of independent Churches may be attained, while each shall retain its autonomy. During the Colonial period closer federation for common interests was sought and promoted by a series of conventions of governors and commissioners from the several Colonies. Through such personal conferences of statesmen, who realized the situation and had the vision of something far better, the weakness of their separation was removed, and the strength of their union was obtained. This is the plain, direct way in which practical steps may be taken towards more intimate and efficient Church unity. Already a decided step in this direction has been taken. Over four years ago the large conception of a "World Conference on questions of Faith and Order as a first step towards unity," was first lifted up, and then brought down to an actual, concrete undertaking. Since its initiation the work of realizing this twentieth century vision of faith has been steadily pursued. Its preliminary organization now comprises commissions of more than fifty of the larger Christian bodies, including the several Nonconformist Churches of Great Britain and the Archbishop's Committee of the Church of England. A deputation was about to sail to visit the Continental Churches of Europe to secure their co-operation, when the war prevented its going. This visitation has been postponed, but not abandoned. As soon as

practical they will go; and at the earliest possible time after the war the World Conference will be convened. While we wait for peace, now is the time to make every practical effort possible to combine the religious forces of our own country so that they may form one solid force to overcome in the future the anti-Christian powers which render wars inevitable. For the means of beginning to do this, the simplest and direct way is to look to the local constitutive units of the several Churches throughout the country. The unit of the Episcopal Church is the diocese of the Bishop. The other Churches have various local bodies with at least recognized representative character to speak the mind of their Churches in the vicinage. Many are asking at this hour, Who will show us any good? The war is motive enough to lead Christian men from all sides to meet and take counsel together concerning what organized Christianity ought to say and to do. In view of this general solicitude, and under the burden of this epochal obligation, those charged with the preparation for the World Conference have requested the Bishops in all the Episcopal Dioceses in the United States to take the initiative by inviting a number of representative clergymen and laymen, from the different Churches within each diocese, to meet for personal conference concerning these highest interests of Christianity. This request is made in full confidence that religious leaders from all the non-Episcopal Churches, gladly laying aside subordinate issues, will be quick to respond to such invitation, praying that our American Churches may together win the right to be called the children of God, as they shall become the makers of peace. Besides their efforts plans also are now under consideration to call very soon a preliminary conference of all the Churches of North America, in order that they may stand ready to do their full part in this greater work of the one Church throughout the world.

When this World Conference shall be convened, prob-

ably in New York, it will not assemble to discuss questions concerning the causes of the war, or to concern itself directly about armaments, treaties, or Hague conventions. It will meet to consider what the *practice* of Christianity shall require of the Churches of every name throughout the world. High above all enmities and causes of separation it will raise the flag of Christ's great commandment. It may well be the place and the hour of reconciliation for religious leaders who shall be gathered in this neutral land for this single and supreme purpose, who are now thrown into the passion and the warfare of their own countries. Its influence shall be carried by them far and wide. Treaties, arbitrations, declarations of international law shall have their binding power secured in Christ's Christianity for the world.

It is said that in one of the wars of the Netherlands the battle raged round the Cathedral of Antwerp; and all the while the streets below were filled with the shouts of the warriors and the tumult of the strife, the bells of the Cathedral tower from above continued to peal their peaceful chimes. We may be well assured that, above all this conflict of the nations, through the upper air Heaven's sweet chimes of charity have not ceased to sound. After the tumult of the fearful strife shall have ceased, they shall ring in a new era of the peace of God.

At this World Conference, where no echoes of the combat shall linger, it will be for the American Churches to welcome those who from all nations shall then be gathered here in one place; their convening will present the supreme obligation of a splendid occasion for representatives of the Churches of all peoples to speak with one voice, and as one power, in behalf of international, rather let us say, super-national Christianity.

Christianity Psychologically Examined[1]

By Friedrich Niebergall, D.Theol.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Heidelberg.

1.

To investigate the Christian religion psychologically means that, instead of applying ourselves directly to the study of the historical ground work of the faith, we endeavour to analyse the psychic condition of the Christian believer, using whatever means general psychology affords us for discriminating and understanding such phenomena. We are solely concerned, therefore, with the study of psychic conditions which make up the subjective religiosity corresponding to the objective religion; that is to say, to a certain complex of perceptions and habits. We must not go a step further, to say aught concerning the truth of those perceptions or the lawfulness of those habits. It matters not whether they be affirmed or denied; in either case the boundary that divides the psychological from the philosophical discussion of religion would have been transgressed. Of course an investigation like the present might lead on to an incursion into metaphysical territory if, after having discovered what Christianity really is, we set out to inquire concerning its truth. A more important extension of our investigation, however, would be in the direction of practical Church work. If it supplies useful hints for

[1]Translated from the author's Ms. by Lionel Strachan, M.A., formerly English Lecturer in the University of Heidelberg.

reviving and strengthening the Christian faith, that will be the best result of our inquiry.

Before we begin we must come to an understanding as to the terms of the inquiry. Where is the Christianity to be found that we propose to examine, and with what psychological aids is the problem to be attacked in detail? We must not, of course, take our Christianity from haphazard individuals, for we know not how many foreign elements have amalgamated with it, even in the best of them. We must look rather for ideal, more or less literary, expressions of normal Christianity.

They must also be acknowledged normal expressions of Christianity, so far as that is possible in such a region of quest and controversy. No great opposition will be offered, I think, if we begin by suggesting two such documents: the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed. If it may be questioned, with regard to the former, how far it originated with our Lord in its several parts, all Christians will agree in feeling that the possibly added parts were added in His spirit. The significance of the other document is a more difficult question. It is not so oecumenical as the Lord's Prayer; and where it is accepted it is subject to many doubts and various interpretations. We adopt it nevertheless, for it is certainly most closely bound up with Christianity. It also represents a form of expression of the faith which belongs to a later date than the Prayer. That is important, for we know that the essential nature of a spiritual phenomenon unfolds itself not in its first beginnings, but gradually in the course of its development. We hope, moreover, by our method to contribute to a better understanding of the Creed, and to bring out its points of agreement and disagreement with the Lord's Prayer. Obviously there is no need for us to take these two statements of the faith in the historical sense that their originators may have connected with them: we take them as they appear to us nowadays. Nor is there any need to remark

that, general and objective as this investigation is meant to be, it can no more divest itself of a subjective character than other investigations of similar type. This follows from what has been said above: the essential nature of a phenomenon at once spiritual and historical is continually developing or unfolds itself in its development. As Troeltsch has rightly shown, in the attempt to define the essence of Christianity, that essence is itself exposed to constant evolution. We cannot get over this subjective obstacle when we try to grasp objective spiritual facts, even if we remain entirely within the boundary of the spiritual world.

What means do we propose to employ in analysing these formulations of faith? The best theory of the life of the soul seems to us to be what is called "volitionism" —or more exactly "emotionism." On this theory the life of the soul is built up as follows. At the bottom of all is the will to live, with a foundation in metaphysics. The will to live is displayed in a number of impulses. Among them must be reckoned all the exertions calculated to conserve and promote the well-being of the individual, *i.e.* not only the animal impulses, but also the spiritual, with which must be included the highest fundamental endeavours towards ideal ends, *e.g.* towards harmony of mental conceptions, towards perfection of the moral personality, and towards communion with a supramundane Being. The goods correlative with these impulses are to be found in the outside world. They are apprehended by the Ego by means of the instruments of perception. These range from the sensation which perceives sensuous objects to the imagination which is the organ for invisible values. It is the task of the feelings to express the relation of the impulses to the goods. The feelings are the organ of the soul for the reflex produced in the life of the Ego by the goods. If the whole environment of the Ego is favourable to the acquirement and possession of the goods, the feeling

responds with inclination; if unfavourable, then with disinclination. According to W. Wundt there are two other pairs of feelings, also diametrically opposed: excitation and tranquillization, tension and solution. The first of these two pairs expresses the relation between things and the Ego: things as they always are or as they happen to be, act as a stimulus on the Ego, arousing its attention, heightening its interest above the usual average, and increasing its whole intensity, or they reduce all these to the average or below it. The second pair, tension and solution, has rather to do with the attainment of things: in tension the Ego reaches out after things; in solution the tension is removed, for either the thing desired is attained or else its attainment is renounced. Such are the bare elements of the life of the soul, to which all the fundamental phenomena of the soul can be reduced, with only a slight departure from the psychology of Wundt. On the other hand, harsh as it may sound to say so of such things, most of the phenomena can be produced from these elements. It is assumed, of course, that here as in the natural world the ultimate essence of things defies both analysis and synthesis.

On this point a word or two more must be added. We have found two sorts of psychic organs, one making the Ego, the soul's centre, conscious of foreign objects, the other making it conscious of its own condition. Many important connections exist between single organs of the same class or of different classes. The objective elements of consciousness, which are of chief interest to us here, because we are concerned with religion, are the intelligence, *i.e.* the power of bringing together single phenomena of the outside world, and the imagination, *i.e.* the power of seeing invisible things. We observe that the imagination always fashions objects of the invisible world according to models furnished by perception of the sensuous and visible. After that the intelligence rules as firmly in the invisible as in the

visible world. The subjective elements of psychic life enter into a number of well-known phenomena: feelings, affections, passions, moods, desires, etc., may be explained as combined effects of various factors. A connection is always set up with one of the objective processes, however vague may be the picture of the objects that bring about the condition. So, too, a picture of this kind can hardly arise in the soul without finding an echo, however faint, in the life of feeling. The manner in which the two classes of psychic organs influence each other is difficult to formulate. This much seems certain: the life of impulse, or, to be more exact and to introduce an expression of decisive importance to us, the appreciation of values made by the Ego and expressive of the life of impulse, determines as a rule what one sees, hears, thinks, and above all how one pictures to oneself the invisible world. On the other hand, however, the images will again awake the corresponding feelings and appreciations, provided their rudiments are present in a man. Only then can we say that all is true and unsophisticated in the soul; there are, however, feelings which are aroused not only by the idea and conception of goods, but also by the desire to have such feelings—a desire connected with the image of a gain. Thus many a man who says the Lord's Prayer may be far from possessing the real feelings correspondent thereto, but he has the desire so to feel, and consequently believes that he does.

Thus equipped from the armoury of psychological science, let us attempt the examination of the two venerable symbols of our faith. Let it be done with all the reverence due to such sacred things. But their venerable character must not deter us from trying to discover what conditions their originators wished to see prevailing in the souls of those who sincerely use them as prayer and creed. We will inquire first and foremost concerning the appreciation of values contained in them, then con-

cerning the picture of supernatural things therewith connected, and finally concerning the degree of will-tension which they express.

2.

What is it that a person who prays the Lord's Prayer is supposed to have at heart? To judge from the first three petitions, it is that God may be acknowledged and have the dominion in all the world. We feel at once that this dominion can only be of a moral nature: it is desired that good may prevail. This becomes still clearer when we examine the last three petitions. In them evil is prayed against in all three forms that it can have: the debt that lies behind us, the temptation that lies before us, and the evil that is in us. We feel at once that here is the utterance of a fairly strong excitation and passion: away with sin, and let God and the Good be set up! There is, therefore, a very strongly moral appreciation of values underlying the prayer: the one petition for daily bread does not detract therefrom. That only brings out the more prominently the strong appreciation of moral and spiritual goods which is to constitute a normal characteristic of those who use the prayer. It prepares us to recognize a sort of dualism running through the whole prayer: there is a world of lower values, of which bread is the only one deemed worthy of mention, and at the same time a world of higher values, represented by a large number of examples. We note further that the petitions are in favour not of an individual but of a community, and in this too we may perceive a direct concession to moral considerations.

To what extent are imaginative forces represented in the prayer? It is addressed to a personal Being, who is called our Father in heaven, and to whom the concluding words ascribe dominion, power, and glory. The picture is therefore modelled on that of a good and strong human father, idealized in the same way as the

painter idealizes his model. The Father is conceived as the Lord of the world, who overcomes all kinds of obstacles and is able to give all good things. His dwelling is in heaven, an invisible place, for which there must also have been a model, obviously some human locality, where everything seems good and perfect. Heaven is no doubt conceived as above the earth; we are at liberty to look upon this "above" as the expression of superior value, without attaching to it any spatial significance, though such was no doubt originally inherent in it.

The fundamental tone is one of humble, trustful confidence, corresponding to the image of the Father. That image may have been sought as the expression of the confidence: now it serves constantly to arouse the confidence. It is a confidence united with reverence, but no such shy timidity as to exclude the warmth of trustfulness and childlike devotion. We may say that over the whole prayer lies an atmosphere of solemnity, in which we detect the feeling of inclination combined with tranquillization and tension. Beneath it lies a desire proceeding from a need; if the need is a disinclination with excitation, the desire is inclination with tension.

To sum up: the Lord's Prayer is an expression of wishes; they relate to moral goods; but these are conceived as belonging to a world above the world of experience. We are thus concerned with transcendental moral values. The wishes are based on a strong confidence; this may be described in general terms as optimism, or more particularly, since it refers to a person, as personalized optimism. Since the mighty Will in which this confidence is placed is, like the moral goods, conceived in a transcendental world, we may say that the fundamental frame of mind underlying the Lord's Prayer is a transcendental, personalized, ethical optimism. Regarded as the expression of an impression, the prayer stands for the conviction that a supramundane Will, conceivable as a Person, can and will bestow moral

goods that proceed from Its own higher world and extend into it again.

3.

If we now go on to examine the Apostles' Creed in the same way, we are warned not to begin by tackling the second article, which is the object of so much dispute. We ask then whether there cannot be found elsewhere in the Creed expressions for goods and values corresponding to those in the Lord's Prayer. And indeed there are: from this point of view the third article is the most important. "The Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of sins, the Resurrection of the body, and the Life everlasting"—all these goods are there enumerated *seriatim*. As we cannot deal with each of them separately, we content ourselves with remarking that they are spiritual and supramundane goods which are here said to be the possession of the Christian. Forgiveness is the only one of these goods common to both the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, if regard be had to their actual wording, but it is not difficult to show that in their whole character the values enumerated in the two documents do not greatly differ. The Prayer, as distinguished from the Creed, places in the forefront such goods as daily bread and deliverance from temptation; the Creed expressly lays stress on the communion of believers, which the Prayer presupposes. The Holy Ghost, the life everlasting, and the resurrection which that presupposes, may be regarded as expressions for God's dominion over His children, which inspires them and makes them free, and at the same time puts an end to the dominion of evil. It is clear that here too, apart from the words and concepts, we are concerned with psychic values of the highest order, which are appreciated by those who profess the creed. Now comes the peculiar feature of the Creed: it brings these values into connection not only

(as in the Prayer) with the God who is the Lord of the world and the Father of those who believe in Him, but with Jesus the Lord, His Son. It may be said that the second article, dealing with Him, describes the way by which the moral goods desired come from the Father and Lord of the world. They are thus bound up with an historical personality, and its developments, extending into a realm beyond and above history. This produces a considerable enrichment of the imaginative elements in comparison with the Lord's Prayer. The goods are brought into connection not only with the God who calmly rules the world, but also with a personality whose history has a beginning, and is to end, in eternity. That personality is introduced as the intermediary of the gifts bestowed by God upon those who believe in Him.

Now let us listen to the notes of feeling sounded in the Creed. The fundamental note is no doubt similar to that of the Lord's Prayer: the note of reverence and personal devotion; there is also the same note of confidence and joy. It differs from that of the Prayer inasmuch as desire is changed into possession: everything sounds more confident and more exalted, in proportion as possession is more joyful than the best degree of confident expectation. The same note is audible also in the suggestions underlying the first and second articles. If the things of high worth are in the possession and gift of the Lord who created heaven and earth, one can be quite sure of them. In the same way it is not difficult to detect the same note in the enumeration of the stages in the life of our Lord: if the note sinks at the words concerning His earthly end, it rises all the higher at the mention of His resurrection and ascension. The same fundamental note is sounded here as in the whole of the Creed: confidence that the highest goods are safely guarded in good hands, but with no concealment of the seriousness of the responsibility before the judge.

Now it is not difficult to see that the same fundamental

conviction has secured expression here as in the Lord's Prayer. Again we have optimism, and optimism of a personalized kind; again it refers to goods of a moral order, extending into the transcendental. Again the fundamental conviction finds expression in appropriate imaginative forms: heaven and earth as two different regions, ruled however by the same God; God as the Father who can and will give. He does not, however, give directly as in the Prayer, but through His Son who is likeminded with Him and next to Him in power. Besides this last there are two other features in which the Creed differs from the Prayer: firstly, the Creed speaks of possession, where the Prayer speaks of desire; and secondly, the use of "I" shows that the Creed addresses itself to the individual, while the use of "we" in the Prayer connects it with the community.

4.

Judged, as we have judged them, by their fundamental temper and fundamental conviction, the two documents are the product of one spirit; they part company only if regard be had to certain imaginative elements. Starting from the conceptions that distinguish the Creed from the Prayer, we soon come upon the source of the differences: the prayer is Synoptic, the Creed is Pauline. The conclusion is clear: the two documents point to two different types of New Testament religion, agreeing however in their fundamentals, *viz.* in the appreciation of spiritual goods, and in the conviction that God can and will give them to His children. At this point a person's fundamental conception of religion will be decided: if he lays more stress on the imaginative elements he will emphasize the difference between the two types unnecessarily, or he will be at pains to bridge the gulf by all sorts of means. A favourite method is to read Paulinism into the Synoptic type. If, however, he lays the chief stress on the other elements, *i.e.* the appreciation of values, the funda-

mental temper and conviction, he will prefer to emphasize the agreement of the two types. It is of course possible for the individual in this second case to be familiar not only with emotional states and appreciations but also with the goods themselves corresponding thereto. These for the most part historical remarks scarcely require to be supplemented by the observation that there are present-day types corresponding to those of the New Testament. The distinction between "Liberal" and "Orthodox" is perhaps traceable back to this source. The Lord's Prayer would then be more characteristic of the one party, and the Creed of the other. The "Liberals" lay stress on the goods and wish to receive them as directly as possible from God, whom they trust without reserve. The other party are somewhat more strict and rigid: they have not confidence to receive those goods unless facts of a quite extraordinary kind have occurred to give a reason for them or to justify their bestowal upon mankind. It seems that this difference or opposition is one of what may be called the "polar" phenomena of spiritual and historical life; it always appears as an historical and psychological necessity, and so the believer should respect it as the will of God. Instead of turning the two types into distinct religious species we ought to regard them as distinct and ineradicable varieties of the same religious species, *viz.* Christianity. But the predilection of all Christians for the words "we alone" when speaking of their convictions and their rightfulness is too great; no less great is the necessity we all feel to prove to those who think differently from ourselves that they cannot really be possessed of the good things they think are theirs. The strife between the opposing schools of thought will be ended when they both endeavour to become more deeply acquainted with the goods of Christianity and suffer each the other to derive them from God and to establish their reality in their own way. Until that time

comes let us rejoice that we know what faith is: we think we have found it in the optimism of which we have been speaking. Thus we realize clearly what faith is: the source of happiness and strength. Because it is optimism, it is a source of happiness; because it is an ethical optimism, it is a source of strength; because it is personalized, it gives us something to hold on to; its transcendental character raises this optimism above the fluctuations to which otherwise our happiness and our strength are exposed when we cling only to the visible.

5.

This view of ours gives us, we believe, the key to many other expressions of the Christian life. We must always inquire what impression of life and the world any particular saying or story aims at expressing. Let us give a few examples which seem to contain the same conviction that we have found to be characteristic of the two documents we investigated. Romans 8:28 ff. quite clearly contains the same fundamental tone, and so does I John 3 ff. Few hymns will be found without it—provided that they strike us as really Christian. So too all prayers that are acknowledged to be truly Christian are tuned to the same key. Could we gaze into the souls of those to whom we owe the accounts of the great miracles wrought by Jesus or on Jesus, or the souls in which those miracles awaken sympathy, we should find the same thing: the Ascension, for example, expresses it most beautifully. Here again the opposing schools of thought differ from each other: one party takes the report of the miracles to be an expression of a mood, the other party makes it one of their main supports.

It remains now to look for a moment at expressions descriptive of a Christian's duty in the world. Anyone familiar with Scripture will soon be able to find passages that harmonize with our view. As a rule they are great comprehensive sayings, designed to indicate the normal

line of effort for a Christian. Thus it is certainly a climax in the Sermon on the Mount when Jesus says (Matt. 5:48), "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect", or "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). From St. Paul we may quote the not easy thoughts at the beginning of the sixth chapter of Romans, especially verse 4, where the obligation to walk in newness of life is inferred from the communion with Christ's death and resurrection which distinguishes those who believe in Him. With this may be compared Col. 3:1–3: "If then ye were raised together with Christ, . . . set your mind on the things that are above". We find our general idea very clearly in St. John (I John 3:3): "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure".

In many other passages prescribing the behaviour of Christians it ought not to be difficult to show that the underlying presumption is a state of mind identical with the results of our analysis, *viz.* the faith that, at least in another portion of the universe, good will be victorious, because it is the will of the mighty and holy God; to devote oneself personally to Him is the root of all Good. Thus the spirit of the New Testament may be conceived and expressed as personal religiosity in the manner attempted above.

Our formula helps us still further: it throws light on the difference and the similarity between Christianity and other religions. Optimism is common to them all, for every religion rests on the conviction that the things esteemed by man as goods are protected in the hand of the Deity to a degree beyond the power of man. The question is what sort of things man sets value upon: whether they belong purely to this present life and are of the sensuous and selfish kind, or whether they soar higher. The former is the case with the ruling spirit of the religion of the Old Testament; the book of Job

describes the crisis in this kind of religion, the only solution to which is a form of good that defies destruction by the evil of life. To all modern attempts at making a neat and orderly religion our formula opposes the barrier of personalism. There is a radical difference between two religions, one of which has a personal conception of God and consequently of man's ideal and happiness, while the other never gets beyond impersonal thinking about both because it thinks the neuter "it" more scientific than the masculine "he".

Let us turn to single branches of theology. It would be the task of dogmatics first to show that the disposition and attitude expressed in our formula represent the highest development of happiness and strength possible to man, and that the natural instinct of religion implanted in man attains perfection in that disposition. The next task would be to develop the disposition in terms of the intellect in order to exhibit the whole view of life and the world, God and Jesus Christ, and man, which it presupposes. Thus it might be asked: What is the conception of God corresponding to this disposition? What are the corresponding conceptions of man, of life, of the world? Furthermore, redemption and final perfection come to appear as vivid dramatic presentments of the certainty that underlies the disposition. The justification of the sinner by grace through faith contains essentially nothing but the certainty that, in spite of all gloomy views of the position of the human soul, our trust in God is not misplaced: by trusting in God man may be won for a life that has its content and its goal in eternity. In the light of this disposition Jesus appears as the One who gives the right to adopt it: he who is thus disposed is redeemed by Him, and there is no redemption but would express itself in such a disposition. All God's works and all guidances of man by God seem to be designed to elevate man to this disposition of soul. One who has got so far will view even the hard dispensa-

tions of his life in the golden light of his Christian optimism and see in them the guidance of a divine Educator, whose aim is to place us above material things with their sorrows and joys, assaults and temptations by placing us under His control. In other words, the regard we feel for One, the Highest, lessens our pleasure at gaining or sorrow at losing the things of lesser worth.

Practical religious work on individuals knows no higher aim than to pave the way for that fundamental religious outlook, or to strengthen it if it already exists. If that is present, faith is present too, even if one is not sure that it is faith, even if one is shocked by some phrase or other which it may choose for its expression. If the outlook is there, the new life springs up spontaneously as from a root planted by the Holy Spirit, for a cheerful, happy man will become a good man: optimists are generally pleasant people to deal with. The way can be paved for this fundamental outlook by various methods: the best is by proclaiming the Gospel as the message which accords exactly with that outlook. Whoever proclaims God as the holy and benevolent Will presiding over the world may reckon upon an echo being returned from what seemed to us to be the right sort of optimism. There is of course one further requirement: man's appreciation of values must be raised more and more to a spiritual and moral level. That is to be attained not only by fair words: it is accomplished most easily when someone who shares that high standard of values devotes himself wholly to others. In intercourse with one's fellows, and in occasional words uttered from the depths of the soul, it is easiest for the standard to communicate itself to others. If then life prove such as to shatter our ordinary optimism as it did Job's, we may be able slowly to rise to the heights. In the faith which we have here been analysing as religious psychologists lies happiness and strength—a proposition which it would not be difficult to corroborate on psychological grounds.

Authority and Orthodoxy

By E. J. Widdows, M.A.,
Gotham Grove Baptist Church, Bristol, England.

Many earnest souls are tremulous with real concern at what they call "the passing of conviction." They are distressed because the older orthodox convictions under the constraint of which a former generation of religious people lived and laboured have no longer any hold upon a large and an increasing number. Passionate appeal is made for a revival of religious dogmatism; we must recover our convictions and regain the old note of authority.

Such appeals, however fervent and sincere, are fatally ill-founded on a misconception of the meaning of the word conviction. Conviction is not something I lay hold of, but rather something that lays hold of me. I form my opinions; I myself am formed by my convictions. It is of no avail to thump the desk and cry to men to get back their convictions; more necessary is it to explore the ground on which we stand to-day and to enquire the reason why some older factors in religious thought have lost their hold on us.

We confront the challenge of a new age riotous with new-born forces nurtured in rich developments and fresh discoveries, and we must face it boldly and without evasion, remembering that the call of God has often sounded in the challenge of the world. In every realm of our religious life and interest it meets us—in the study, in the market, in the mission field. The fact is, we are living in a new and vastly larger universe than did our fathers. Into this modern age have come new

view-points, new perspective, "new thoughts of God, new hopes of heaven," and new ways of emphasizing old ones. A thousand forces have contributed to push back our horizon and to furnish a new mental atmosphere.

There are the revolutionary ideas which have come through modern science. It is a matter for congratulation always when the spiritual truths which underlie all life and experience are more fully illuminated or are recovered from some temporary clouding. We live in such a time. Religion has a sounder rational standing than a generation back. Then the dramatic unveiling of great scientific laws left religious thought in intellectual chaos and a very general feeling was abroad that the foundations of the Christian faith were undermined if not destroyed. When Darwin published his great work in 1857 this was the immediate effect. It filled strong men like Matthew Arnold with a pensive melancholy for it seemed as though the sea of faith were ebbing and the fabric of religion crumbling. In many less robust than he the new wine of science went quickly to the head and it produced profane and empty babblings.

Now every truth seems dangerous until it is familiar. There are vested mental interests which are averse to new departures and which feel the pain of new ideas. Today we have rewritten all our text-books from the evolutionary stand-point; those that ignore it are as lumbersome as any based upon the Ptolemaic system of the universe. Such an idea as this could not but radically influence religious thinking, not only in a critical but in a philosophic sense. The narrow views and the foreshortened setting of a few decades ago are now impossible. The root idea of God is left untouched except to give it infinitely grander setting and significance, and in the glow and glory of this central fact all other features of the Christian system share.

The modern social movement is another revolutionary element. The awakening of a social consciousness is

characteristic of our age and it has found expression in a multitude of ways. We have begun to feel the truth of Herbert Spencer's dictum: "No one can be perfectly moral until all are moral; no one can be perfectly happy until all are happy; no one can be perfectly free until all are free." This new great thought has radically influenced our moulds of thought and methods of activity, and much in the religious content of a former day is rendered obsolete. We must approach the challenge of this new ideal remembering that Jesus said the new wine must be put into new wine-skins, and undismayed that "new occasions teach new duties." The seething pool is being stirred by agencies that are divine and there is need for strong men who can carry with them into its disturbed but healing waters both the languid and the timorous.

But our social service must become the unforced fruit of faith. There is the fear that some are turning to new duties of our modern life as an immediate outlet of religious fervour which seeks to silence apprehension by impetuous effort. If our religious activity be only the feverish effort to allay unsettled faith; if our multiplication of conferences is only a cloak for lack of conviction; if social service is only a palliative for sickness of soul and our perspiration only due to dying principle, we shall cut a sorry figure in the future. We must take our religious bearings.

And here we are met by another challenge in the widespread study of comparative religions. We have become familiar with the sacred writings of the great religions of the world, and in our colleges are chairs in this important science. This ecumenical consideration of religion cost a pang to many but it has not been prejudicial, as it was supposed it might be, to the Christian faith. Comparison has but disclosed the inherent superiority which it possesses, clarified thus as it could no otherwise have been. It was the folly of unfaith to

hesitate so long to place our own religion on a common basal level with the other world-religions fully, freely and unprejudiced. But all this has inevitably widened our religious thinking and we are less parochially-minded than we were.

Undoubtedly the influence of most tremendous moment comes from modern Biblical research and criticism. The historic pride of Protestantism has been its reverence for the Bible. It gave the Book in vulgar tongue and has at all times been prepared to rest upon appeal to Scripture. We are today the heirs of scholarly activity by a whole host of Bible students of all nationalities and certain views regarding both the origin and nature of the sacred writings, not to speak of minor issues upon which there still may be some difference of opinion, views in respect to which all scholars are agreed, which stand in irreconcilable and irretrievable conflict with what was taught a generation back. Much positive service has been rendered by these men. The study of the Bible has been correlated with all other study by the frank acceptance of the principle of growth. "Debate has been closed upon many vexed questions by relieving, once and for all, inadequate moralities of earlier days from the impossible task of doing duty as permanent standards." It has added immeasurably to human interest in the Book by showing that it was not dropped from the skies but slowly wrought into the experience of real men who faced our life of duty, temptation, and sin, and found the joy of salvation. By more accurate appraisement of documents it has increased our sense of perspective and enabled us to link the emphasis of real and permanent teaching with the cancellation of inadequate and temporary.

This work is being done by Christian men, devout no less than daring, and this fact should give encouragement. If we have accepted some conclusions which involve relinquishment of certain old defences it has not

been at the clever gibe of cynical, unsympathetic writers such as Robert Ingersoll, Tom Paine, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, but at the gifted guiding of constructive genius. Indeed it was an easy task to triumph over a belief in verbal inspiration; such attacks today are so much tilting at the wind. As Dr. Gladden says:

> "The Scriptures never claim an absolute accuracy for all their statements or in anywise ask us to believe it. The Apostles were inspired but it is certain that the inspiration did not make them infallible in their teaching or in administration of the Church. They made mistakes, and sometimes of a serious nature. It is beyond all question that the majority of the apostles took at the beginning an erroneous view of the relations of the Gentiles to the Christian Church. They insisted that the only way for them was through the synagogue and Temple. It was a grievous error striking at the foundations of the Christian Church, and this error was entertained by these inspired Apostles after Pentecost. It influenced their teaching and it led them to proclaim a defective gospel. This is not the assertion of a sceptic, it is the testimony of the apostle Paul as we find it in the second chapter of Galatians."

Jesus himself set the example of reverent criticism of the Scriptures and to him the older writings were not all of equal value or of final import; and modern scholars find the same course necessary in the treatment of the letters and the note-books of the Christian writers. But it does not end there. Questions arise as to how far we have authentic records of the facts and teaching of our Lord himself; how adequately he was understood, and how far the subjective element is introduced. To what degree are the recorders influenced unduly by their own particular age and preconceptions; and are there any elements which are the outcome of attempts in retrospect to set forth later theories concerning him? Then, too, the psychological approach to understanding of the Person of our Lord has emphasized the fact that Jesus himself, while on the one hand conscious of an unique and peculiar spiritual relationship to God and of a definite redemptive mission, almost inevitably used the thought-forms of his age, and confessed his own agnosticism on some points. One postulate to any modern

thinker must be a really human mind in Jesus, subject to the necessary limitations involved in mental life. It is only this mental limitation which explains why he, like his contemporaries, ascribes to David the authorship of the 110th Psalm, with the assumption therefrom that David foresaw a glorious Messiah; or that accounts for his belief in the existence of demons, a company of personal evil spirits under the leadership of Satan against whom he as founder of God's kingdom was to wage a final warfare. Such assumptions could be increased by very many instances revealing that his thought was limited alike in regard to exegesis, understanding of the development of prophecy, and the form of the content of his Revelation.

"The recognition of these phenomena in our Lord's life," says Dr. Gore, "leads us to the conclusion that up to the time of his death he lived and taught, he thought and was inspired, and was tempted as true and proper man, under the limitations of consciousness which alone make possible a truly human experience."

This is the point of view which modern psychology regards as the proper preliminary to an understanding of the personality of Jesus, and the grounds of his divinity must be found along other lines than that of mental infallibility. The immediate duty of theology is to establish upon the basis of religious experience what belongs to the absolute content of the revelation of Jesus and what to the form as conditioned by human mentality and current notions of his day.

The moral perfection of his Person guarantees his intimate relationship with God and the absolute certainty of the spiritual content of his revelation, but can, in the nature of the case, yield no such guarantee for the infallibility of form, in so far at any rate as that form is essentially a matter of religious indifference. The concrete forms of thought in which his revelation was expressed are taken from the currency of his age and are directly due to his study of the prophets and Apocalyptic.

They were no doubt the best through which his eager soul could vehicle the implicates of his own sublime conceptions; yet it must follow from his true humanity that his notions physical, metaphysical, and exegetical, cannot be taken as final or accepted as the only permanently valid forms in which the truths he felt can be expressed. Such limitations of mentality and consequent formal imperfections, bibliological errances, and lack of latter-day historical perspective do not affect the permanent validity of those supreme religious truths which sprang from his unique self-consciousness and spiritual relationship with God. As Dr. Denney tells us:

"There is a vast region of things in which there neither is nor can be such a thing as authority, the region, namely, which is covered by Science. Now questions of the kind to which reference has just been made all belong to the domain of Science. The nature of the book of Jonah, the date and authorship of the 110th psalm, the explanation of the morbid phenomena which the ancients ascribed to evil spirits inhabiting the bodies of men—these are questions for literary, for historical, for medical Science. . . . The truth which we owe to Jesus and for which he is our authority is not information; it is not a contribution to science, physical or historical—for this we are cast by God upon our own resources; it is the truth which is identical with his own being and life in the world, which is embodied or incarnate in him. . . . He does not claim to know everything, and it would be difficult to reconcile such a claim with true humanity; but he does claim full knowledge of the Father, and not his words only, but his whole being and life are the justification of his claim."

The authority of Jesus lies in those great religious truths which have escaped the narrowing Apocalyptic formularies in which for the most part he embodied them, for his revelation is a greater thing than he himself was perhaps aware. Beyond the Church, beyond the Bible, and beyond the *ipse dixit* of our Lord himself, these great truths which we derive through him, which are the very life of God, persist and dominate the hearts of men. The teaching of Jesus, says Holtzmann, is like "a crystal which according as it is held, enables us to see either the dark and heavy substances from which it has grown, the colour of the earth to which it belongs, or else displays the golden glory of the sun in purest and

ethereal splendour." The temporal and particular is inevitably interwoven with the universal and eternal, but the timeless elements predominate and underlie all else. It is these that were decisive in the inner life of Jesus; these which never caused misgiving or perplexity; these to which he ever points his followers, in which his parables and prophecies all culminate; for the sake of these he yields his life and in the strength of them he rests when all beside seems dark.

While his own relation to his "Gospel of the Kingdom" makes natural an intensity of self-consciousness so that he can often speak with such conjunctions as "I and the Gospel," "Me and my words," it is quite clear that he regarded his authority as resting on the truth made manifest through him. It is great objective thoughts which form the theme of his addresses. Once when a woman with adoring wonder cries, "Blessed is the womb that bore thee and the breasts that thou didst suck," he quickly turns from the subjective aspect, from his person to his cause: "Yea rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and do it." "Why callest thou me Good," he answers to a seeker after life, "there is but one Good even God. But if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments."

His own authority, he implies, lies in the fact that he is carrying out the will of God and witnessing the Truth. His kingdom is the kingdom of the truth and he himself has come to witness to the truth. "Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice." Not those who profess belief in him or say, "Lord, Lord," but those who act upon the truth to which he witnesses will enter in. Even misconceptions or aspersions which concern his person are forgiven, but never a rejection of the spiritual truth for which he stands.

He never claims finality for his own expression of the truth. His revelation is suggestive rather than exhaustive—the opening of a door and not the building of a

fence. He did not attempt to lay the measuring-line of definition round the boundaries of the Infinite. The minute interpretations and the wearisome logomachal disputes of Scribal calculation caused but impatience to the soul of Jesus, filled with the vision of a kingdom so far-reaching and sublime that he could only speak of it as like unto this or that.

And Christianity is just a great dynamic reconstructive principle, subject to constant metamorphoses, that lapses leisurely into the kingdom of truth and measures its seasons by centuries, and it must not therefore be confused with any set of forms or final doctrines summarizing what men thought or said or did some eighteen hundred years ago. Beliefs change, methods wear out, expressions lose significance, and symbols become obsolete, for altering conditions frequently demand restatement of the truth.

How many are the possibilities of progress which are implicit in these principles! How wonderful the orientations actually disclosed by an historical investigation of the doctrines of the Christian faith! How many variations have its ethical conceptions and its expectations undergone! Into what unexpected and diverse relationships have they entered! What new combinations, what novel emphases, what mutual relationships may yet arise. One thing is certain. Christianity has proved its power to answer new demands and to express itself through new conditions and it still will do so. Its very life indeed, as does all life, depends on its continued growth and its creative evolution. Prof. Eucken says:

> "We not only can, but must be Christians;—only, however, on the one condition that Christianity be recognized as a progressive historic movement still in the making, that it be shaken free from the numbing influence of ecclesiasticism and placed upon a broader foundation. Thus here lies the task of our time and the hope of the future."

Now it is always difficult for the man in the study to rightly estimate the interest in religion of the man in

the street. Some tell us that theology has lost its hold entirely on the modern man—its truths regarded as but old wives' fables and its formulae of no more value than the old-time nursery rhymes. So it might seem if we expect to find on all expressions of religious feeling the familiar hall-mark of our own. But the fact is, though official Christianity has a narrowed hold and orthodox pronouncements are more rare, there has been a wonderful revival of religious interest. This is seen in all directions, most noticeably perhaps in the enormous circulation of the books which deal with some religious topic in a popular way. The affirmation of belief, the tone of certainty, may be less common; old terminologies may be exchanged for unconventional expressions; but an increasing number think about the facts with which religion is concerned.

More than half a million men in this country alone are meeting every Sunday afternoon in connection with the Brotherhood movement. These men are interested in religion, but they are suspicious of ecclesiastic systems and of formal doctrines. There is something too tyrannical about the former, something too mysterious and remote about the latter. Church doctrines men will no longer swallow with shut eyes and open mouth. They know now that doctrines are but statements of the interpretation of facts, and they want to get to the facts themselves and put the statement in a language of their own. The dust of centuries lies thick upon the greater part of our religious phraseology, and the striking fact is, few of those long words so unrelated to the ordinary man's experience were ever used by Jesus, and these men have found this out. Books on theology still seem to introduce one rather to the dry museum of a botanist than to a garden with its living bloom and fruit. The modern man smiles at our terminology just as he does at the botanic names of flowers. They grow perhaps in his very garden but he has more simple terms for them.

The homely remedies which cure his ills he much prefers to know undignified by pharmacopœdic polysyllables. He wants a religion that is not only expressed in simple terms but that itself is simple. He is tired of ancient creeds and empty phrases, and hungry for the simple statement of religion made by Jesus when he said that it just meant love to God and love to men. "And after that no man durst ask him any question." Base religion on creeds and theories and dogmas, and you get a host of critics; let its centre and circumference be love, you silence every sceptic. Abraham Lincoln, when reproached because he did not join the church, replied, "When you can show me the church that is willing to inscribe over its portals 'Love to God and love to men' I'll join that church immediately," and multitudes of people feel the same today.

Then, too, the old tone of finality and dogmatic authority in theology is resented by the modern mood. We are told that we live in an age that is impatient of restraint. But we may easily be misled. It may be rather sifting of old sanctions, sometimes the superpositing of one authority over another however rightly or wrongly calculated.

That there is much to cause concern need not be questioned. In political and civil life, in moral matters and religious, there is much upheaval and unrest. Much modern literature reveals this spirit of revolt against established notions of morality. Nietzsche complains that Christianity has stood for a morality both morbid and emasculating, and Bernard Shaw and others have caught his complaint and shock the Christian world with his iconoclasm though without his strength of character. The same thing holds in the religious sphere. The modern attitude towards marriage and the Sabbath are outstanding instances of how religious sanctions are regarded by those who have swung with the tide, casting free from ancient anchorage, impatient of every chart and compass.

AUTHORITY AND ORTHODOXY

One of the most insistent questions of the hour is that of the limits of liberty and individualism. It is forced on us on all hands. Especially in religion do we need to review our position and to find bed-rock, for religion holds the key to moral and political stability. One of the first things we are taught by Nature is that there are rigid limits to individual liberty. We have freedom of action but none as to results. "The whole system of things in which we live is one which holds freedom in very narrow limits." There is always some authority which in the broadest sense is external. A purely subjective principle of authority breaks down. It is out of accord with psychologic laws of growth in knowledge. Mysticism in religion ultimately lies open to attack from every sceptic. It is obvious that there are elements of genuine knowledge in religious experience, and this knowledge lifts religion above the plane of merely logical deduction and supplies fact-basis for religious teaching. The only question is where such authority resides and how it shall be exercised.

The authority of the Church as such is gone. The rapid advance in every department of knowledge has dissipated the idea that any limits can be set to seekers after truth. Finality in faith is quite impossible to those who see the thousand barriers faith has burst by its disruptive force. The note of authority which has dominated theology is regarded with a not unjust suspicion by those who know "the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns." They know a bit of history; know how ecclesiastical conservatism often has developed into resolute hostility to progress; know how in the middle ages the entire social and religious life of the people was based upon subordination, the word authority writ large—when there was no salvation for the individual outside the great religious system which watched over him from the cradle to the grave and held the passports to heaven; know that the claim to infallibility

and finality advanced by Rome is only the courageous clear expression of a claim which every church has more or less implied although the ground of it be shifted to the Bible or to the theology which is but its interpretation of the Bible. And they know the Bible does not make such claim, and any knowledge of its origin and growth destroys such an assumption.

The entire history of the modern era may indeed be viewed as the awakening of the spirit of reflection, revolt against tradition, demand for freedom of thought and feeling and action. Political conflict has been settled in favour of the State which has gradually absorbed the functions of the Church as organ of education and philanthropy. In the realm of religion there is the same demand for a free field. The notion prevails that truth is not something to be imposed by authority or decreed by papal bulls, but something to be acquired by free inquiry and experience, and men ask to see the credentials of those who would impose it. They have eaten of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, right and wrong, and the fruit is no longer reserved for theological specialists.

Now the Church may lead where she can no longer drive. The Bible may not be a goad but it is still a guide,—not infallible but inspirational. A man who has led thousands in safety over some unknown dangerous mountain-side may not be infallible but he has proved his power and his experiential value and you confidently trust his leadership. The Bible has proved its power to save and keep, and the collective experience of the Christian Church has produced a challenging body of truth which presents itself to men as God's great answer to their need. Jesus, while retaining a principle of authority, always himself combines it with a due regard for human will and reason. His revelations of truth are so given as to become discoveries of truth by us. Notice his dealings with his own disciples. He never imposes dogmas. He slowly unfolds his personality and mission.

How he rejoices over the awakened spiritual discernment of Peter. How he seeks to lead them ever to conclusions of their own. And this explains his great reserve, the many things he could not say. "Jesus exercises his authority by transferring it to us." The fascination of Christ to those who love freedom lies in this, that while he ever stirs men to discover truth, he leaves them free to formulate their own interpretation of it. Hence the non-finality of creeds. With constant influx of new life from him we grasp new aspects of its meaning. The religious horizon expands as we rise in religious experience. No consideration of Christ is sound which does not take into account what he has done and what he still is doing. And here we are on certain, scientific ground. We may consent to base theology upon psychology and not on metaphysics; we may accept the modern dictum that there is nothing good but the good will, and that the ultimate appeal is to the personality. All modern notions of heredity and of environment will but intensify the need for re-inforcement. Results of great religious value come along this line marked out for us not by ourselves but by the modern masters of psychology. It changes the venue from the court of logic to that of life, from speculation to history. The older rationalism is discredited and religion has a free field for its evidence in life and action. The argument no more is syllogistic but pragmatic. The decisive evidence of Christianity is to be sought along this line. We have an empirical basis for religious life in the knowledge acquired in religious experience.

Along this line too all the signs of our time are reassuring. Recent poetry is our ally. William Watson writes an ode just published where he gives

> "Deep thanks that I have now of late regained
> That faith in God which I did lose so long."

Francis Thompson and John Masefield glory in a Christianity whose power is practical and evidential. Modern

philosophy becomes our friend. Bergson and Eucken are tutors who lead us to Christ. Science through such men as William James and Sir Oliver Lodge is buttressing our faith. The latter complains because "religious people seem to think it scientific not to pray," and tells us "that so far as ordinary science has anything to say to the contrary a more childlike attitude might prove to be the truer one and more in accordance with the total scheme." "Why should we be so incredulous?" he asks, a novel question for religion from the lips of science.

Such quasi-scientific cults as Christian Science are significant and every moiety of truth in them is an essential of the truth proclaimed upon the hills of Galilee. A notable conference of doctors in the States has recently declared its firm conviction that the only cure for inveterate drunkenness is "hypnotism and prayer," in either case the super-imposing of a strong will on a weak one, the re-inforcement of the feeble by the strong—a frank admission of the need which Christianity alone can adequately meet. Modern criticism has not left us a Christ-myth of Drews, still less a mere residual human character. It gives us a real Jesus, one whose relationship to God was single and sublime, whose moral grandeur is incomparable, whose teaching is unrivalled in its moral purity and splendour, in whose work and Person lay a force capable of producing what the centuries have seen. The claims of Jesus are still made good in renovated wills and quickened lives. We may confront the challenge of our age, then, with well-grounded optimism. Every aspect of human life comes under the law of externalization of experience in canons, standards, institutions, accepted in a thousand forms simply because the past experience of the race impels consent.

We have our positive message. Difference of mental outlook does not alter moral need, and with all the merits of modernity there is still much weariness and struggle, temptation and sin, and the essence of Christianity

is not revelation but redemption. This is the Lord's song which we are called to sing in a strange land, and no harp must rest upon the willow. The accent may be differently placed but the song is that of Moses and the Lamb, of moral law and pitying love, and there is need to sing it bravely both for our own sake and for the sake of those who live in the strange new world in which we live. Men will listen to it.

Knowledge and Love

By Dr. A. J. de Sopper,
Minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, Amsterdam, Holland.

I

In the course of time men have cherished very different ideals. It is not always easy to get to know them. The best way to do this is to consider what we desire for our children, to whose charge we commit them, what object our education aims at.

Allow me to mention some of these ideals: the priest, the general, the saint, the athlete.

Nowadays the authority of the priest is lost. A general's laurels attract but few. The halo of the saint has become dim. The athlete is honoured, yet there are only few who dare call sport the principal thing in life, and who judge a man's worth from his biceps.

At present, the ideal for many is the professor. At any rate in old Europe life has been ruled for a considerable time by the cult of the scholars. They are the saints of our days. Their word has authority, their rebuke carries weight, even in matters outside the field of their special studies. They are looked up to. A library or a laboratory is thought of with reverent timorousness. The great power, the great ideal is: knowledge. And that is why the first and principal thing urged upon young people is: to acquire knowledge. We allow our children to learn a trade if there is no help for it, if they are too stupid to study, or if we have not the means and can not get them, but studying—that is *the* thing

worthy of man. A father knows no greater source of pride than that his boy is only so old and is already in that form, or is first of so many, or has passed his examination with honours. It is his knowledge that determines a man's value.

In connection with the aim of this periodical it might be asked why these things are brought up for discussion here. My answer is: religious life is not detached from life. That which concerns life closely, rules it, directs it, is of the greatest importance for religious life.

If it is said that religion concerns the salvation of the soul, I want to remark: Your soul does not hover in vacuum, above reality, but is connected with reality by countless threads, and if it is to be saved this will have to happen by giving it the right attitude in the midst of reality.

There seem to be people who think they hear God's voice only then, when things are discussed in which nobody takes any interest, things which are not in order, which may have been, some centuries ago. We must entertain different thoughts of God: when He speaks, it relates to things which are in order, which are of importance for the reality of the present.

The attitude I denoted above is fatal in its consequences, especially for religion. Professor Obbink, in a recent number of THE CONSTRUCTIVE, rightly remarked that we Dutchmen are particularly exposed to this danger. However, I am convinced I am not mistaken in thinking that all men are more or less menaced by it. Perhaps, through habit, we have got a little more skill in fighting it, and perhaps we can serve others with it.

II

St. Paul has it somewhere: "Knowledge puffeth up" (I Cor. 8:1). That is a word many love to hear. There have always been religious circles where knowledge was looked upon with suspicion and where science was con-

sidered a danger, a kind of poison to be distributed in case of emergency only and then in homeopathic quantities. Ignorance and illiteracy are the conditions pleasing to God, the soil in which virtue and piety flourish best. Hypocrites, people who selfishly exploit stupidity and superstition, I do not mean here. I mean people who shrink from knowledge, because they are of opinion that their dearest goods of life are cunningly attacked by it, because they see in it a power which boldly penetrates mysteries, the desecration of which they wanted to guard against, which lays a sacrilegious hand upon the divine mysteries. The more knowledge, the less love, they think.

As far as the word of St. Paul is concerned we have a wrong interpretation here, and, with regard to the matter as such, an unacceptable standpoint—unacceptable, not so much because of reasons of an intellectual nature, but very decidedly because of reasons of a religious nature.

God has created man in His image. It is He who gave us all our faculties. To each of these faculties He gave its value and meaning towards the harmonious development of our being. How could the development and the use of a faculty derived from God be sin? It is blasphemous to think so. To be sure, we can abuse these faculties, use our powers in a wrong direction and to a wrong end. That is sin. But in this respect knowledge is on a par with all the other faculties. Why of all others should the wondrous faculty of the mind, which rises like a sun over things and lifts them out of the night of unconsciousness, be wrong as such? It is no sin, but a sacred duty to use it.

Now let us turn our look from the subject of knowledge to its object.

God has not only created man, He has created heaven and earth, the whole of the universe. When we get to know this we get to know something of Him: the heavens

declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork. The object of our knowledge is as divine as the faculty of knowing. What spiritual damage there has been done because religious people have so often thought that the Kingdom of God is only there where our intellect can not penetrate, that it is only there we are in touch with God. In this way religion is put outside life and its sphere suffers the same fate as the territory of the Red Indians: it becomes smaller continually, every step by which knowledge advances limits its province. Fortunately in reality the opposite thing is the case: to a truly religious man every truth that is discovered is a thought of God, which He gives us the privilege to ponder. Not only are we unable to withstand truth, we do not wish to either. Honest research can do no harm in whatever sphere. We are not afraid of any truth whatever.

When Champollion visited the pope on his return from Egypt the latter asked him if he was not afraid his discoveries might be dangerous to faith. To this it is said that Champollion answered:

Saint Père, la vérité ne saurait être contre la vérité (Holy Father, truth cannot be opposed to truth).

He was right.

To neglect and underrate knowledge is also wrong for this reason, that the fulfilment of the task, which God has set us in the midst of creation, is omitted or impeded by it. *Jede Gabe Gottes ist eine Aufgabe* (Every gift of God is a task). "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and *subdue it*": the condition and means to do this is knowledge. God has put that means at our disposal. The possibility of knowledge, a wonder about which we can never have finished thinking, is a reality. It is a sad phenomenon when religious people I do not say are no scholars—that is not everyone's vocation—but when they sneer at and despise knowledge and preferably leave it to those they call impious. It is sad,

especially as it is a religious fault: contempt of a gift of God, neglect of a commandment of God.

III

Yet St. Paul is right: knowledge puffeth up. That is not at all incompatible with what has been said before. Knowledge as such is not spoken ill of. If so, one might answer at once: as if stupidity and ignorance do not puff up! What is said here only refers to knowledge detached from the moral-spiritual background and foundation of human life. Intellect is good, but intellectualism, that is to say, the excess of power, the partial overestimation, the tyranny of the intellect, is one of the archenemies of mankind.

We saw that to neglect and underrate a gift of God is to maim a creature of God. To allow the one gift of God to render the other powerless, to take away its authority, to rob it of its influence, to impede its execution, is certainly no less a maiming of God's creature. If part of a choir falls out, it does not increase the value of the whole. But if one part sings so loudly that the other can not be heard, it is not conducive either to increasing the harmony of the whole. Develop almost exclusively a man's intellect, teach him to value it above everything and appreciate it above everything, and you get a horrid man, who will also behave horridly.

There is the clever boy of the man I mentioned just now. To be first of his form becomes the sole tenor of his boyhood. To excel in knowledge is the only thing he aims at. Piety and tenderness of heart, they are not spoken of or thought of. That cunning and deceit are made use of in order to remain first, is a trifle, properly speaking a proof of cleverness, and that is what matters after all. Confidence, affection, devotion among school-fellows, would do harm rather: to raise his value, to incite to intenser acquiring of knowledge, it is necessary that the child should see in his school-fellows rivals whom

he is to surpass and towards whom he is to be filled with envy. Ambition and egotism, directed towards knowledge, are the great passions of his life. That child becomes a man, and we need not wonder when we often see scholars and schools of scholars use each other, or rather ill-use each other, with a contempt, a pride, a bitterness, which passes description. How often, in reading scientific critiques and polemics, we call to mind the words: Knowledge puffeth up. That the attitude of such men of knowledge towards those who do not possess it will not speak of less conceit, may be expected. The Greek calls everyone else a Barbarian.

I once more return to that boy. The father looks down on his son with pride. But it is not long before another feeling mixes with it and presently prevails: the father perceives that his child looks down on him in quite a different sense. The boy laughs at father's simplicity and mocks at father's wisdom and shrugs his shoulders at so many things dear to father. Such parents reap what they have sown, they have maimed their child, have neglected the human being in the child, have only cultivated his capacity for knowledge, and now they experience (conscious of their education having been a failure) that instead of a man they have produced a puffed-up machine of knowledge.

The intellectualist adopts the same attitude as that boy in his appreciation of past and present. We know the view of history taken by Wagner in Goethe's *Faust* and we know how "the thinking part of the nation" is accustomed to place itself in the opposite ranks of the religious and church people. Various things have raised partition-walls, dug gulfs between men and men: race, rank, social position, birth. No distance is greater than that caused by intellectualism between the "cultured" and the "uncultured". There is no conceit that is so conceited as that which is the consequence of knowledge.

Of course this does not stop at appreciation and criti-

cism but turns into deeds: if the value of a man and of life depends on knowledge everything must give way before it, and everything be arranged in accordance with it. Then everything else is loss of time and power and must be removed as soon as possible. These "enlightened" ones are disturbed by the lights in the heavens. They must be extinguished.

That which has become history and is given to us in history loses its significance. Sociology, psychology, etc., teach us to know the mechanism of social and individual life. And when we know it we can make it. History becomes a machine which is fitted out according to the designs and formulas of the people who possess knowledge. He who does not agree with them is an obstacle to culture and injures the highest interests of humanity. An enthusiast of knowledge is very jealous of his dogmas. No persecutor of heretics is more intolerant and no inquisitor more pitiless than a fanatic of enlightenment. The most odious tyranny is the Jacobinical one. One faculty in a man dominates over the other faculties: the man in whom that faculty prevails tries to dominate over other men. He assumes for them the part of Providence. He demands obedience like a God—indeed the height of conceit!

Just as intellectualism maims and impoverishes the man who knows, it maims and impoverishes that which is known. It does this in very different ways, but it always denies the reality of that which is beyond it, or at any rate has no eye for it. Its actual field is stagnated, congealed, dead reality. It cannot get into right touch with movement, change, life, especially spiritual life.

This mutilation of reality takes the strangest dimensions when the intellect only acknowledges as reality the special field of research towards which it is directed: take, for instance, the physiologist who says nothing is except atoms. Professor Kohnstamm has once in a

striking manner compared such a physiologist to an official of the militia who should assert there are no women, because only men appear in his office.

The fulfilment of our task suffers as well. It is true, great progress has been made in governing nature. The praises sung in honour of this are many. Yet it looks as if they are getting less loud. First of all, there is a great deal wanting in this government. But even if this was not the case, technical command of nature does not make us inwardly free from nature. We do not regally rise above it, do not use it for a higher purpose. On the contrary, we remain confined within the round of the life of nature. Everything goes more quickly, but we remain within the same area. No new values have entered life. Knowledge has changed much and raised great expectations. Superficially life has become richer and fuller. It has not got a new meaning.

Here also knowledge, detached from spiritual-moral life, produces a semblance without reality. Here also knowledge puffeth up.

IV

All this very decidedly holds good of religious knowledge as well. This as such is not at all wrong either. How could there be anything wrong in the knowledge of God and of His service? And St. Paul does not disapprove of it. He calls knowledge one of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Of the first great dogmatist of Christianity nothing else might be expected.

Religious knowledge is good, but there is also a religious intellectualism, and that is a dangerous form in which that archenemy of mankind lays his snares for us. We should beware of placing the element of knowledge in the foreground in religion, of allowing everything else to be robbed of its importance because of it and of allowing religious life to be wholly absorbed in religious knowledge.

He who seeks the value of man in his knowledge, detached from moral-spiritual life, turns man into a caricature. Consequently he who seeks the value of a religious man in his religious knowledge, detached from love, turns a religious man into a caricature. For religious life is more than intellectual knowledge. Intellectualism makes a man an immoral being: religious intellectualism makes him an irreligious being. It makes him seem what he is not. Religious knowledge also puffeth up.

The contempt, the bitterness, the pride with which religious people of a different way of thinking combat, is without parallel in history, and *odium theologicum* is notorious. How the religious intellectualist, the man who prides himself on his religious knowledge, generally treats others who do not possess it in his opinion,—alas, we know ourselves how conceited our religious knowledge makes us towards them as soon as love diminishes. How very superior one man then feels to another! With what self-complacency the partition-walls are then raised! How zealously points of difference are sought! Indeed, there is a distance even greater than that between the "cultured" and the "uncultured", the distance between "believers" who have no love and "unbelievers" who have no knowledge. There is a pride still more dreadful, a conceit still more terrible than that which is the consequence of knowledge, the pride, the conceit, which is the consequence of religious knowledge.

Here also people do not stop at appreciation and criticism, but come to deeds. When we speak of intolerance and persecution among worldly people, we derive our denominations from the history of religion: persecution of heretics, inquisition.

And here also it is not possible to acknowledge the meaning and the right of that which is peculiar, characteristic of, that which has become historical in persons,

circles, nations. The religious intellectualist knows absolute truth. Everyone must believe as he does. He who does not, is an unbeliever. Like a God he sits in judgment on his fellow-men. Can anything be more conceited?

This as far as he who knows is concerned.

Now a word on that which is known, the revelation of God.

According to the religious intellectualist God reveals sentences. Jesus Christ has enlarged the inventory of our knowledge with some items. He has caused wrong conceptions and views to disappear and has communicated right knowledge. We now know how to think of God and His service. What mutilation, what limitation of God's work of revelation, which has not in view enlightenment of the intellect but renovation of our individuality!

And then, finally, our task. It consists in acquiring this knowledge for ourselves and giving it to others. Extension of the Kingdom of God is tantamount to advocating a system of ideas. God has been replaced by an idea of God, religion has become Godless. To enter into religious communion is tantamount to allowing oneself to be puffed up by knowledge.

V

This intellectualism is not an intellectual fault. It cannot be refuted. It is no use arguing against it. To think so is the mistake of all who think they can advance religion by enlightenment. They are surprised when they attain the opposite of what they intended and when people are confirmed in their intellectual dogmatism in spite of their efforts. The case is simply this: intellectualism cannot be cured by intellectualism.

This intellectualism is a religious fault, and religion is only advanced by religion. The essence of religion is Love, for the essence of God is Love. Ice only melts

through heat, and spiritual death only yields before a current of new life. That is why St. Paul says: Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.

Divine love touches the individuality, takes hold of a man's innermost being. It builds up, but in order to do this it must first pull down. In Jesus Christ man comes in touch with a Divine love which first of all saves him from his self-love. It makes man realize, not that his conceptions are wrong, but that his individuality, his life, is wrong and sinful. It reveals to us the holiness of God, not as a thesis we accept, but as a terror, a judgment come upon us through our contact with Him, as a death on the cross which we are to die. But he who dies with Christ will rise with Him to a new life. He reveals God's holiness to us as love: He condemns us, and, wonderful, it does not bring us to despair, but causes hope and faith to arise in us. We are lost in valuelessness and, strange to say, at the same time we become conscious of having eternal value in God's eyes. Jesus Christ does not reveal God's holiness to us as a thesis, neither does He God's love: it is the power which, out of the ruins of the old, selfish existence, causes the new life, the life of love, to rise.

This love is different from what we are accustomed to call love; a certain amount of affection, good-will, sympathy, good-nature, different also from the natural tie binding parents and children, brothers and sisters. I need not enlarge on this subject. Everyone knows the hymn of love, I Cor. 13. When this finds an echo in a man's soul, he does not feel the need of contradicting Jesus when He says: a *new* commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another.

Whereas knowledge puffeth up, this love edifieth.

Whosoever lives in this love is no longer tempted to determine his own worth by his knowledge. His value is in his personal, spiritual-moral life and the value of that he has received as a free gift of mercy from the

hands of his God, and with all his faculties and talents he wishes to serve that one great, central principle of life that gives unity and harmony to his life, through which that life grows and is strengthened. And he is also preserved from the danger of feeling himself to be superior to his fellow-men because of some talent or excellence. He realizes that everything in which he might surpass his fellow-man is of very secondary, indeed of no, importance in comparison with that in which they are both equals, namely his being lost before God.

Far from being the partition-wall between men, Christianity is the cement that keeps them together. He who is a Christian does not look upon his fellow-men, non-Christians as well, as enemies he has to persecute with fire and sword, or as devils he has to abhor and despise, or as rivals he has to surpass, but as men, that is to say, children of God in hope, about whom his religion teaches him that Christ also died for them, and whom he has to love, to edify through love.

To those who had not the least objection to eating the meat that had been sacrificed to the idols St. Paul says: You are right, but do not boast of it, do not be puffed-up because of it, do not offend your weaker brother, but love him. Love him, that is to say, enter into his life, descend to his level to help him on—as Jesus did. Love is sacrifice, self-denial. Love and the cross are closely connected. Love is no weakness, but manly strength: if it can be of help to his brother St. Paul never wants to eat meat. Of course this does not mean that we are always to side with prejudice and yield to it. Those who are of another opinion are also men who have their souls to lose, who ought not to be offended, but have a right to our love.

St. Peter and St. Paul were not agreed on circumcision. St. Peter, like the Jewish Christians, wished to make circumcision a condition of embracing Christianity. What was St. Paul to do? If he decided against circum-

cision, he would offend the Jews, and if in favour of circumcision, it would be tantamount to offending the Gentiles. His choice is different here from the former. Urged by the love for souls and convinced that those restrictions, by which Judaism was made the portal of the temple of Christianity, would close that temple to the Gentiles, he declares himself publicly against circumcision. We very often come across analogical cases: then our conscience must decide before the tribunal of divine love and all selfishness must be excluded. Those who are our inferiors in religious knowledge, or whom we think are, should not feel our superiority in knowledge, but our superiority in love. Mission is splendid. But I sometimes ask myself whether it is not much easier to give some money to convert heathens across the ocean than to love the heathens, or those we think so, in our surroundings.

He who puts the "charity" that "edifieth" into practice, does not wish to make his neighbour like himself, to urge his own ways and views on his neighbour. That is troublesome love, which is pride and selfishness, and does not strengthen but estranges and embitters. The charity that edifieth causes one to love according to the needs of the other, first and foremost gives man the right and the opportunity to be himself.

What the needs of another are only true love knows. There is no true knowledge without true love. It alone penetrates to the essence of its object: "And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know" (I Cor. 8: 2). Mephistopheles sees clearly and knows much. But he only knows the bad and unworthy things of man. He lacks love. Of Jesus alone, who was love, it may be said that He knew to the full "what man is". It was a grand moment in the history of the world when St. Paul on the Areopagus at Athens spoke of the brilliant intellectual period of Greek culture as of "the time of this ignorance".

KNOWLEDGE AND LOVE

Knowledge puffeth up. That which it produces, as such, has only an apparent value. It decays, bursts like a bubble.

Charity edifieth, produces something of lasting value. When the world falls away from us, the only thing that retains its value for us is the love we received and gave.

The highest thing a man can attain is that he is able to say what is written on Kingsley's grave: *amavimus, amamus, amabimus.*

A Dynamic View of the Deed of Christ

By F. Herbert Stead, M.A.

This paper suggests a glimpse. It does not attempt a panorama. It is no more than the act of the tourist who fixes the lens of his tiny camera on a rock or a crevasse in a vast range of mountains. The picture he takes as little represents the Alps as these pages the Atonement. But even the small photograph, if it correctly catch one facet of the million-sided pearl of the mountains, is not without value. Along with countless other snapshots, it may help towards filling in a picture of the colossal scene. So may this glance at one phase of an illimitable mystery be justified.

In seeking the standpoint whence our view is taken, let us keep our feet firmly, step by step, on the unyielding basis of admitted fact. To plod onwards on plain and even obvious facts, may not appeal to the heroic imagination, but it will commend itself to those who distrust equally the abysmal profundity of the traditional theologian and the aeroplane flights of the transcendental philosopher.

Let us begin with two facts which are quite familiar to the ordinary Christian consciousness. They are facts opposed and contrary. They form the contrast distinctive of the Christian experience. One is a sense of bondage to the past, a feeling of the tyranny of moral use and wont, a consciousness of the difficulty, sometimes amounting to utter inability, involved in any endeavour to break loose from the chains of evil habit. This feeling

of fetteredness, always present, has been intensified by the tendency of modern science to see everywhere an unalterable sequence of cause and effect. The other fact is a sense of glorious freedom from the past, a certainty that the soul is no longer held by what it has been, a buoyant assurance of ability to do and to be, irrespective of antecedents. The second fact succeeds the first sometimes in an hour, or even in a moment.

But these two facts, which stand over against each other in such jagged contrast, are bridged by a third fact. The transition from one state to the other coincides with the arrival in consciousness of some thought about Jesus Christ. This arrival may be ushered in by any out of a number of outward events. It may be flashed into the mind by the sight of a crucifix, the sound of a hymn, the glimpse of a sacred picture, the taste of the sacred wafer, the appeal of an evangelist. But, howsoever introduced, it is the thought of Christ which marks the transition. In the first state the force of will is consciously unequal to the task of emancipation. In the second state the emancipation has taken place, and the will is now conscious of possessing a power that maintains and renews the state of emancipation. The influx of power comes with the thought of Christ.

These two opposing facts, linked with the third fact, have received an indefinite variety of expression, but abide through all the ages of Christian experience. The simple working man of the twentieth century tells you, "If you put your will under the Will of Jesus, you find it easier to keep straight, and not so easy to go wrong." The impassioned Apostle of the first century declares, "I am sold under sin": yet "I can do all things through Him Who strengtheneth me."

Of this classic expression of the contrast the plain man may perhaps fight shy. "The plain man," once a familiar figure in theological and philosophical discussions, may be resuscitated for the purpose of this study:

for it is undertaken primarily in his interest. Trained to think in terms of immediately verifiable fact, he shrinks from the large assertions of the mystic as much as from the abstruseness of the theologian. He pushes past both to the simple records of fact given in the Synoptic Gospels. There in the earthly lifetime of Jesus he finds the same curious contrast and transition. He sees men and women condemned by their own misdeeds and by the social odium consequent on their action to a state of moral impotence and despair. Yet, on the appearance of Jesus, he sees these same publicans, harlots and sinners loosed from their past and able to lead a new life. The personal habit of their lives was broken. The indignant social expectancy which had surrounded them with a sort of necessitation to further evil lost its power over them. They were free. They felt themselves to be free to live as though their past had not been, to live as though scandalized society had no longer any power to force them down.

They probably did not know how it came about. But somehow Jesus in a very real way stood between them and their evil past. When it threatened to assail them and overwhelm them, He seemed to come between it and them. In His presence, or as they remembered Him, the onset of the black days that had been was foiled. He broke the shock of despair which would have fallen on their hearts and ended the consequent paralysis of will. He also came in between them and the social odium that recoiled upon them from their past. Quite spontaneously, with a cheerful chivalry that did not pause to ponder consequences, He stepped in to shield them and bore the brunt of the hostile criticism which was their due. When the Pharisees would dismay them by condemning or despising, Jesus interposed. He simply would not let those hardhearted critics dishearten his once fallen brothers and sisters. The cataract of Pharisaic abuse and scorn fell on Him, not on them. So, all the way

through to the end, He stood between them and their evil past. He stood between them and the social consequences of their past. The sequence of their previous life and its social concomitants seemed somehow to spend its force on Him: it did not reach them. The weakening and paralysing effect of their former conduct was rendered inoperative by Him. This process went on to the end. And in the End it became more drastically potent than ever.

Even the plain man is perforce constrained by the facts to acknowledge that what Jesus in His life had been to a few, that He became to the many in His death. The helplessness of the race in dealing with great souls is like the helplessness of the mere intellect when faced with a new creative fact. It will not construct a new category for the new arrival. It only, woodenly and cruelly, tries to force it into the old scheme. This impotence of man was shown supremely in the putting of Jesus to death. Even the best system of religion and the best system of law which the world had known were unable to save it from its piteous inability. The exponents of Jewish faith and of Roman law were constrained by their limitations to crucify the Christ. Was ever the tragedy of man's inability to free himself from the trammels of his past more conclusively shown than in the impaling of Jesus? Yet it is just this tragic fact which is most closely associated in the Christian mind with the completest emancipation from the thraldom of the past. Even the plain man will admit that nine times out of ten the transition from moral inertness—amounting sometimes to a paralysis of the will—into a state of new life and unfettered moral initiative links itself with the thought of the death of Christ. Once he begins to ask why, the plain man finds himself tied up in many a controversial knot. But, being honest, he will not deny the fact, however little he can explain it. He sees that just as the living Jesus freed extortioner and prostitute from the bonds of their hateful career, so and much more

so the dying Jesus has availed for uncounted millions of men to snap the fetters of their evil past and to start them on a new free life. Just as publican and sinner felt that somehow He stood between them and the thraldom of their previous life and of its social consequences, so millions of men feel that somehow or other the crucified Jesus stands between them and the pitiless sequence of their former conduct. They feel that the force that made for persistency in their past, both in themselves and in their social environment, spent itself on Him. He stood between them and the normal consequences of their action. So the Cross is to the human will the symbol of emancipation. The plain man doubtless finds himself unable to understand the relation which he feels undoubtedly exists. The impression conveyed by the thought of the death of Christ is a fact. Its reality is attested by the most dynamic changes in spirit and conduct. The whole life has been in innumerable instances completely changed. Force apparently has been absorbed and force has been liberated.

Without attempting to explore the whole tremendous problem which is opened by this fact, let us isolate one phase. Of the force which was felt to have spent itself on Jesus, let us select one factor. The force which makes men the slaves of their past is commonly known as habit. Habit is undoubtedly a force. The amount of force which any habit possesses may be measured by the amount of force necessary to resist and overcome it. No small power of will is required to break even a small or trifling habit. The habit of mispronouncing certain words seems a little thing. But men of strong will have found its correction a task greater than they could accomplish, even by the effort of a lifetime. The smoking habit, the drinking habit, the gambling habit, the opium habit, enthral men's wills with such potent constraint that sometimes the most terrific exertion of will is necessary to break it.

Individual habit is hard enough to break. But when it is reinforced by a corresponding social habit, the difficulty is immeasurably increased. We are dealing here with no abstruse theological or metaphysical proposition. The plainest of plain men knows that it is hard to break a single habit in one's own life. It is harder to break the habit that prevails in one's own home—it may be of evil speaking, it may be of perpetual altercation, it may be of proud reserve. The habit of one's set or select circle is still harder to defy. For the very selection implies a kinship of habit, and the group consequently implies a concentration of habit. Every medical man knows the force of the social habit which has precipitated in the etiquette of his profession. The larger the society and the longer the persistency of the habit, the greater becomes the force of will needed to defy it and break it. The social habit of a nation may become intensely *bourgeois*, or utterly devoted to mammon. The national atmosphere is then that of judging everyone by the standard of material possession or material comfort. It weighs upon every member of it with a subtle unseen force that only reveals its awful power when one strives to strip oneself free from it. But who can gauge the degree of will force needed to break not the habit of an individual or family or tribe or nation, but of the entire world? Yet this is precisely what Jesus did.

That is a fact which even the plain man will not dispute. Jesus, in life and death, broke through the habit of the race intensified by ages of repetition and everywhere operative when Jesus appeared. Up till the moment Jesus appeared, the habit of the world had been, to put it at its broadest, unfilial towards God. Fitfully and by glimpses its noblest souls had perceived the overarching Fatherhood of God. But the indurated persistency of the world's way of thinking and acting towards God was not what became the children of an All-Perfect

Father. Men generally were untrustful, anxious, unloving and unfaithful. This unfilial habit, hitherto perpetual and universal, was broken by Jesus. In respect of God, He made a new beginning in human history. This is a fact that cannot be gainsaid.

Equally incontrovertible is the fact that Jesus broke the habit which had till then governed men's relations with one another. The settled custom of the world's thought was not to think of all men as children of One Father and therefore as brothers to one another. The world's habit was distinctly unfraternal. It broke men up into classes and castes and nations. It made a virtue of exclusiveness, of clannishness, of bigoted nationalism. It even profaned the influence of religion to consecrate social, political and racial hatreds. This habit, also hitherto perpetual and general, if not universal, Jesus persistently and consistently broke. His earthly life was one succession of ruptures with the existing order of thought and action. He broke through the claims of the family, broke loose from the tradition and expectation of His fellow-villagers, He burst the limitations of the synagogue, He undermined the prejudices of His nation, He ripped asunder the closely woven tissue of social, racial and religious tradition.

This victorious and incessant break with the sinful habit of the world meant an effort stupendous alike in intensity and persistency. It meant an exertion of will such as the world had never witnessed before. Here was the supreme and unique instance of will-force. Here, if ever, was done a dynamic deed. As in deeds of lesser heroism, it is the heroic will that we magnify. The sufferings of the hero, whatever other value they may possess, are at any rate a measure of the exertion of will needed to undergo, to endure, and to overcome the suffering. The dangers faced, the persecutions endured, the torture and shame and death of the hero, move us because they attest the immovable constancy of his

purpose. The sufferings of Christ are a measure of the power of the Will which endured them: and it is the Will that we revere far more than the pains of death which declared it. The death of Christ, while infinitely more besides, was undoubtedly the culminating proof of the deed that He did and of the power as well as the goodness of the Will that was able to do it.

Jesus having broken the habit of the race thereby makes a new beginning. Of that new beginning, all who attach themselves to Him are able to avail themselves. His deed makes their freedom possible. Once the habit of a home, of a circle of friends, of a club, of a workshop is broken by some brave spirit, it loses its coercive power. So, in a transcendent degree, was it in the case of our Lord. He made a breach in the brazen wall of racial habit and those who follow Him can pass through the breach that He has made. He breasted the torrent that had come sweeping down the ages of the world's persistency in sin, and those who step behind Him are safe from the raging cataract. He has established, by a heroic effort of will, a new precedent which all may follow, though none could create. So those who but a moment ago were helpless victims of the past of the world, now find themselves in freedom, elate and able. So, as a matter of fact, He stands between them and the sinful past of mankind. He stands between them and their sinful record. He stands between them and the worst consequences of their previous fatal course. Putting their will under His Will, the vital transition is effected, the impossible becomes a reality, the bond becomes free, the victim becomes victor. He grappled with the world and flung it, and His victory becomes ours.

So far our study has shown Jesus as the world-conquering hero, the Mighty One Who has shattered the bonds of the human will and bestowed on His followers the largesse of an unconquerable freedom. But He was more.

Even within the narrow range of our present survey He was more, infinitely more.

Much has already been said of habit, of the strength and persistency of habit. The idea now needs a little closer examination. Everyone knows that if you do a thing once you find it easier to do it a second time, and the oftener you do it the easier it becomes, and, further, the more likely you are to do it. As the habit grows, the effort required becomes less and less. The child makes a prodigious effort when first required to wash its face on a cold winter morning. But by frequently repeating the act, as the years go by the child feels the effort less and less, until the morning wash becomes habitual and almost automatic. Similarly, the first lessons in music cost the child much painful effort until the first exercises in fingering are mastered. With the fully developed musician, the early efforts are forgotten, and by frequency of repetition the fingers perform their task almost spontaneously. Life is made up of instances of the growth alike in facility and propensity which comes from repetition. Habit is thus the result of the law that action grows easier by repetition and tends to repeat itself.

This is a most beneficent and merciful law. If every action on repetition cost the same effort as at first, our time would be completely occupied with the most rudimentary activities. If each time we wrote a letter we had to repeat the agonies we suffered over the copy-book at school, there would be no literature. If there were no habit, life would be utterly clogged. We would not get beyond the state of infancy, for habit is a vast economy of will force and of time. Thanks to it, we do things more quickly than at first, and have both time and energy for fresh ventures. The progress of the individual is only rendered possible by the law of habit.

So with the progress of society. Society does easily and without thinking about them a thousand things

each of which at first cost much collective effort. The usual name for social habit is custom. Law and order are but the settled habit of society. They come quite naturally to an Englishman. They are an insufferable burden to a Russian desperado. To comply with them requires from the savage an extreme effort of will. The advance of civilization lies in just this power of habit. Things once learned become easy, and the energy they once absorbed is now free for new developments. Those who will not avail themselves of the experience of previous generations as crystallized in social custom tend to revert to savagery.

The law of habit is obviously essential to progress. It is right and good and most helpful. In it we reverently discern a most salutary law of God. Thanks to it, the painful struggle involved in first subduing an unruly temper becomes only a memory when the work is done. The old man smiles as he recalls the effort it cost him in his youthful days to refuse to drink or to gamble or to laugh at the ribald joke. The habit of right living has made these things no longer even a temptation to him. The man who has armoured his life with good habits marches in freedom and fearlessness through most of the perils of his career. He thanks God for the law of habit. He knows it is a good law, the law of God.

But because it is a law of God and not the creation of fickle caprice, it is not repealed or abrogated in the case of bad actions. Bad conduct, like good, grows easier by repetition, and tends to repeat itself. The man who for a few days only allows himself to go to sleep again after being roused by his alarum clock, soon ceases to be awakened by it. The abstainer who breaks his pledge once or twice easily sinks into a regular toper. The mind that once or twice harbours thoughts of pollution slides with ease into the cesspool of vice. Pleasure preferred to duty on a few testing occasions has little difficulty in asserting its ascendancy as the dominant

motive of life. The unemployed workman who gives up trying to get work and begins to loaf about street corners becomes in time quite easily an incorrigible idler and unemployable. The liar laughs when he remembers what it cost him to tell his first great lie. These and other equally obvious facts of common experience show that facility and propensity increase with repetition, of evil deeds as well as of good. The strength of the evil tendency lies in the law of habit, which is the law of God.

The same Divine law appears in collective evildoing. A nation which parts with its early simplicity and hardiness and begins to practise luxury with effeminacy, finds it easier and easier to go the downward road. A community that begins to put gain in place of God and substitute profit for love and justice soon finds itself quite hardened in its worship of mammon. In times of revolution, enormities that would once have repelled the most callous conscience have become actual through increasing familiarity with deeds of blood and shame. This law of habit which oils the slope of descent into the social abyss is also the law of God. It could not be repealed in the case of the downward movement without being repealed also in the case of the upward. It could only be abolished by making human progress impossible. Its cessation would mean the frustration of the creative and redemptive purpose of God. So the law of habit goes on operating in the deterioration of some persons and some peoples as well as in the continuous elevation of others.

But this increase of facility and propensity through repetition carries with it in the case of evildoing a most terrible punishment. Sinful action becomes more easy and more frequent. This is one of the worst penalties of sin, that one goes on sinning and sinking into a deeper depth of sin. Evil conduct becomes habitual, and the constant habit of sin is one of the most awful forms of

retribution. This too is the expression of the will of God. It is God's sentence and judgment upon sin. It is the penal expression of the Divine constancy.

The constancy of God alone maintains the unity and continuity of His universe. Physical science in its last resort reposes upon faith in the constancy of God, which it prefers to paraphrase as the uniformity of nature. Human nature and human society are only possible by the unflinching maintenance of the same Divine constancy. It is a condition essential to the realization of His purpose of perfection. Without it there could be no progressive actualization of the Kingdom of God.

So, without plunging into the depths or soaring to the heights of metaphysical speculation, but proceeding with our feet firm on the beaten road of plain and obvious fact, we reach the inevitable conclusion that the strength of evil habit, like the strength of all habit, lies in the will of God. The strength of sin is just the persistency of habit. So the daring words of the Apostle Paul are seen to be true in a wider sense than he intended: "The strength of sin is the law": that same law which he described as "holy and just and good," as indeed "the law of God." It is the will of God operative in the indispensable law of habit that forms the strength of sin, and forms also, as we have shown, the punishment of sin.

We may now revert to what has been said of the Great Deed of Christ in breaking the sinful habit of the race and of the stupendous effort of will which that act involved. The sufferings of Christ, we saw, were a measure of the strength of His purpose. They, so to speak, registered the amount of the force exerted by His Will to save. And it was just His resolute and persistent rupture of the evil habit of the world that cost Him His life. It was the facility and propensity for evil which had been indurated and intensified by generations of repetition that fell upon Him and slew Him. He broke its power. It took His life. But we have just seen that

the strength of the evil habit of the world was the direct operation of the will of God. It was the expression of the unchanging and unflinching constancy of God. It was also the penal judgment of God on sin. And Jesus, in breaking the world's habit of sin, bore full on His heart the strength of it. That is to say, He bore the brunt of the will of God operative in the sinful habit of the world. He bore the penal expression of the constancy of God. He bore the punitive judgment of God on the sin of the world. The accumulated and intensified persistency of the race in sin, which owed its force entirely to the constancy of God, broke His heart. Never was the firmness of that Divine Purpose so conclusively illustrated and vindicated as when it required the Death of the Christ.

This conclusion has often been reached from other premises. It is demanded by many recondite and transcendent reasons familiar to the mind of the philosopher and theologian. But in this study we have carefully avoided the vaster and more transcendent regions of religious reflection. We have purposely limited our inquiry to the facts of experience which are plain to the plain man in his own life and in the life around him and in the simple records of the Gospel. The vast implications as to the nature of Him Who died, and of His place in the universe, have deliberately been left aside for the moment, though without for one moment questioning their absolute legitimacy. We deal here only with what may be obvious to the simplest believer. He cannot dispute that Jesus lived a perfect life, that in so doing He broke the sinful habit of the world, that this involved a tremendous effort, that this effort, measured by His sufferings, cost Him His life. He cannot deny that the law of habit is a condition of progress, that it is an expression of the will of God, that it is operative in evil conduct as well as in good, that it expresses the Divine approval and reward of the

man who struggles to do well but that it also expresses the Divine condemnation and punishment of the evil-doer. He sees that it is the expression of the Divine constancy which maintains at once the uniformity of nature and the continuity of society.

So he finds himself shut up to the inevitable conclusion that Jesus, in breaking through the world's habit of sin, and slain by the strength of its persistency, was really undergoing a necessary infliction of the will of God. He was bearing the penal judgment of God on the world's sin. This statement will naturally be regarded by more fundamental investigators as shallow and superficial. Yet so long as its cogency is admitted, and the conclusion secured to the satisfaction of the plain man, his mind may be prepared for the profound arguments of the more abstruse theologian.

The conclusion, however arrived at, was indisputably accepted by Our Lord Himself. Beyond all controversy, He regarded His death as a necessity imposed upon Him by the will of the Father. It was an expression of the Divine purpose revealed to His mind in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the pouring out of His life, He saw "the blood of the Covenant"—the outflow of a peace offering to the Father. "Not My will, but Thine, be done"—in these words the death on the Cross is recognized and accepted as the Will of God. It was the Cup which His Father had given Him to drink.

This fact transforms the Deed of Christ from a mere victory over the world into a sacrifice unto God. It was indeed submission to the Will of God which ensured the victory over the world. The Will that broke the might of the social habit of the world, by absolute surrender to the exacting Will of the Father, became the channel of Divine life and power to all who follow Him.

Even in the humble walks of ordinary human life, one sees how submission to the loftier Will at once ennobles and reinforces the act of heroic will. The soldier

who dies in winning his country's battle, the fireman who falls into the furnace of flame from which he has just rescued a child, the engine driver who saves the train by sticking to his post in a bath of scalding death, find their highest inspiration, as their dying words often attest, in the thought of Duty. Not the glory of victory, not the applause of the press, not even the lives that are saved, but Duty is the commanding motive. In the warmer and truer language of religion, Duty is but the Will of God, and those who sacrifice their lives at the command of Duty are offering them up as a veritable sacrifice to God. And thereby every other motive is sublimed and intensified in dynamic value. Monica, enduring a daily crucifixion from the profligacy and faithlessness of her husband, bearing it not as an arbitrary and iniquitous infliction of an evil man but as the demand of conjugal fidelity which she knew to be the Will of the Highest: the father of the prodigal, who will not cast off his reprobate son, but in the continuous sorrow of his fatherheart owns the Will of the Supreme Father: the man who will not renounce a dissolute and unworthy friend because he recognizes in the bond of friendship the imperative of the Divine Lover: the patriot who loves his country too well to spare her passionate denunciation and pleading entreaty in the hour of her shameful wrongdoing, and acknowledges in the national odium and maybe mortal persecution which he encounters none other than the awful but sublime sentence of the Ruler of Nations: the lover of his kind who lays down his very life in winning some vast reform for the elevation and easement of the downtrodden and hunger-smitten, and yet who rises above all the chafe and fret and sense of bafflement by discerning that he is called of God to suffer: all these servants and helpers of mankind are transformed from victims into victors, from mere sufferers into saviours. Their resolute acceptance of the awful decree of God makes them not merely instruments

of change but channels of the revolutionary power of God.

These lower rungs in the ladder of life may help us to gain a glimpse of the Great Deed accomplished on the Cross. As a victory over the world, it was the unique dynamic act of human history. As a sacrifice to the Father, it becomes infinitely more potent. "Christ crucified" is none other than "the power of God." So flows into the lives of those who yield their wills to Him the emancipative force which transforms human inability into an ability created by God.

The Unexplored Factor in the Gospel

By T. R. Glover,
St. John's College, Cambridge.

It is a commonplace with those who take literature seriously that what is to reach the heart must come from the heart; and the maxim may be applied conversely—that what has reached a heart has come from a heart,—that what continues to reach the heart among strange peoples, in distant lands, after long ages, has come from a heart of no common build. The Anglo-Saxon boy is at home in the *Odyssey*, and when he is a man—if he has had the luck to be guided into classical paths—he finds himself in the *Aeneid;* and from this certain things are deduced about the makers of those poems—that they knew life, looked on it with bright, keen eyes, loved it, and lived it over again as they shaped it into verse. But it is rather to the first three Gospels that I wish to turn at this moment. Here are books with a more world-wide range than Homer or Virgil, translated again and again, from the first century of their existence on to the latest, and then more than ever—into all sorts of tongues, to reach men all over the globe; and that purpose they have achieved. They have done it not so much for the literary graces of the translators or even of the original authors, though, at least in one case, perhaps in two, these were more considerable than is sometimes allowed. That the Gospels owe their appeal to the recorded sayings and doings of our Lord, is our natural way of putting it today; but, if for "our Lord" we put

a plainer description more congenial to the day when the Gospels were written, we shall be in a better position to realize the significance of the world-wide appeal of his words. Thus and thus, then, spoke a mere provincial—a man who (though far less conspicuous and interesting) came from the region of Meleager and Philodemos—not from their town of Gadara, nor precisely from their district, but from somewhere near them on the map.

He has won the hearts of men—that is obvious. Then, taking our canon (which proves to be his also), what, we must ask, was the heart from which came this incredible power and reach of appeal? "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," he said; and he amplified it by his insistence on the weight of the idle word, the unstudied and spontaneous expression or ejaculation,—the reflex, in our phrase—which gives the real clue to the man's inner nature, and deeper mind,—which "justifies" him or "condemns" him. The περίσσευμα of the heart —its natural and inevitable overflow—shows more decisively than anything else, he suggests, the quality of the spring in its depths. Here is a suggestion which we find true in ordinary life—in the study of literature; and if we turn it back upon its author, he at least will not complain, and we shall perhaps gain a new sense of his significance, by approaching him at a new angle, from an outlook not perhaps much frequented. If he too spoke "out of the overflow of his heart"—and we can believe it when we think of the freshness and spontaneity with which he spoke—of what nature and of what depth was that heart? We can believe very well that much that was unforgettable in his speech to others, he forgot himself;—they would remember, could not help remembering, what he said; but he—no! he said it and moved on, keeping no register of his own utterances, and perhaps not careful, as smaller people are, of the form and turn of his speech. Certainly he gave his followers the rule

not to study their language. Whether he consciously had thought it all out or not, we can see the value of the rule and how it fits in with his way of life, and safeguards it. Under such a rule speech will not be stereotyped, no set form of words will impose itself on the free movement of thought, the mind can and will move of itself, unhampered, and when the mind moves so, it commonly breaks new ground, and handles new things. This, we may conjecture, was his own rule. Not to be careful of the form of our speech means for most of us slovenliness; but a man who thinks in earnest, who takes truth seriously, will not speak in a slovenly way, even when his language is unstudied. With his eye on his object, his instinct for fact will keep his language pure and true.

From the words of Jesus we have to work back to the type of mind from which they come. There is always danger in such a task—one's own mind may not be large enough, not various, quick and sympathetic in such a degree as to apprehend the man we study. How much greater the danger here! And, again, when we study a great nature from one point of view, there is the risk of forgetting all the other points of view from which it may be studied. Here, for the moment, we have to study Jesus in one phase of his human activity. Will the reader please understand, once for all, that this isolation of one aspect of our Lord's activity must not be taken to imply that there is no more to be said?

Jesus was a teacher, but without the teacher's jargon. It was remarked at the time that he taught "as one having authority and not as the scribes"—that he did not deal in quotations. The Old Testament he did quote now and then, but it has been remarked that he used it in his own way—struck right to the heart of the passage and got its real significance, but used it rather as illustration than as warrant or authority. He "had authority," and he got it for himself, as we shall see by and by. On the other hand he is quite free from anything

like our modern way of declining upon abstract nouns. He never, so far as we know, told his disciples to "reconstruct the personality" of the people to whom they went nor to study their "mentality" or anything of the kind. And yet he managed to convey ideas.

Our first point may be best reached by a comparison of two Old Testament prophets. Ezekiel "puts forth a riddle and speaks a parable," and begins so:

> A great eagle with great wings and long pinions, full of feathers, which had divers colours, came unto Lebanon, and took the top of the cedar: he cropped off the topmost of the young twigs thereof, and carried it into a land of traffic; he set it in a city of merchants. He took also of the seed of the land, and planted it in a fruitful soil; he placed it beside many waters; he set it as a willow tree (17: 2-5).

No doubt Ezekiel, if he had been questioned, knew as well as we that eagles do not do such things, but that did not matter to him. Contrast this attitude to nature with that of Jeremiah. The passage about the drought will serve:

> Their nobles send their little ones to the waters: they come to the pits, and find no water; they return with their vessels empty: they are ashamed and confounded, and cover their heads. Because of the ground which is chapt, for that no rain hath been in the land, the plowmen are ashamed, they cover their heads. Yea, the hind also in the field calveth, and forsaketh her young, because there is no grass. And the wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail, because there is no herbage (14:3-6).

Again and again Jeremiah goes to actual living nature —he might have been surprised if he had been told how often he illustrates his thought from bird and beast and country life—but always with a certain precision and sympathy. The actual is all he wants; he does not reconstruct. Bird and beast with him are real bird and real beast—not heraldic, not fabulous, but just such as he had seen and known in a boy's country life.

When we turn to the Gospels we find the same faithfulness to living nature—

> The earth
> And common face of Nature spake to me
> Rememberable things (*Prelude* i, 586).

Nature is enough for Jesus as for Jeremiah; she needs no remodelling—she will do as she is, she is just splendid and lovable and true, and slides into his mind whenever he is deeply moved. Think of all the parables he draws from Nature,—the similes, the metaphors, the illustrations; every one of them will bear examination and mean more as we get into it. The heraldic eagle of Ezekiel serves a purpose; the real bird and beast of Jesus less immediately and bluntly convey any single and selected meaning, but they have the deeper and more eternal significance of the real things which God made—they are more suggestive and more sympathetic the better you know them. God's eagle, or vulture, with its taste for carrion, takes us further than any bird that painters have drawn with many colours. The lost sheep is just a sheep—if it were not, what (for instance) would be the use to anybody of an imaginary shepherd carrying a sham sheep? Who could rejoice with an imitation shepherd—or with a real one who sought and found and carried on his shoulder a papier-mâché sheep, for instance? An artificial hen, like a cuckoo-clock from Switzerland, clucking to wooden chickens—no! no! All these things are real to Jesus, and, as in the case of Jeremiah, he may not have noticed how fond he was of them.

There is the same truth and naturalness about his pictures of industry, outdoor and indoor—it is always real people doing real things, with their minds on their work and "doing it quite." The man with his hand on the plough, if he is fit for the Kingdom of Heaven—if he is a man you could by any chance place there and find a niche for in it—has no time to be a parable; he has just got to plough and keep at it. The woman indoors sweeping and looking for her lost coin was a real woman with a real broom and she was not hunting an imaginary coin;—she may have been Mary, for it was certainly Mary whom Jesus saw putting leaven into

three measures of meal, and he helped to eat the bread; it was real enough, or his little brothers and sisters would have been heard—you cannot feed real children on stones, as Jesus said, and a real father does not want to.—Why should he be so literal? Why must he always keep so close to the real? The reality of the thing sometimes gives enormous force to his irony—the Pharisee polishing the outside of the cup and leaving the inside with its dirt and its germs uncleaned. It is the mixture of sheer realism with the absurdity that gives it its force, as also in the case of the man who carefully strains out the gnat—you can see him doing it—and then (in a wild flight of fancy) swallows a camel whole and never feels it going down. Here he leaves the real;—does he? It is just because he keeps so close to the real, that the humour and the irony are so vivid and so true.

Now let us leave his pictures of the actual for some more imaginative. One or two of them, if a modern word and homely (in the English sense) may be allowed, are quite "creepy." And here too is the same gift of seeing what he describes. A house—and creeping back to it comes a thing of evil, a strange being with signs of travel and fatigue upon it, of days in the wilderness and dry places. Up to the window it comes—stealthily and horribly—"keeks in"—then, in a flash, grasps the situation—the house is furnished and cosy and comfortable, and empty—and the evil thing is gone in a moment; but now it comes back, and in such company! And the last state of that house is worse than the first, as we can well believe. Is this leaving the real? "Yes," says one man. "No," says another, in a tone that is graver, and speaking slowly, "it's real enough; it's my story." Or again—there comes a funeral procession, a bier with a dead man on it, "wound in a linen-cloth," "bound hand and foot with grave-clothes"—a common enough sight; but who are carrying him—those silent awful figures moving swiftly and steadily along with their

burden? They are dead—swathed and bound like himself,—the dead burying the dead. Here again we have that wonderful faculty of seeing the thing, that gives their quality to the pictures from Nature, but applied here to another order of things.

We now pass to a curious group of pictures, as to which every man must decide for himself how far they are what he would call real, whatever he may mean by it. They suggest vision, rather in the psychologist's sense of the word; but they may at the same time belong to the imaginative group. Whichever way it is, there is the same gift of "picture-seeing" in them that we have found in the other classes. Three times at least Jesus gives pictures of Satan. At the temptation Satan "in a moment of time" (Luke 4:5) shows him the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them—and the adverbial clause is as significant as the rest of the sentence. It illuminates his mind for us in a very important phase of it. We ought to have been able to guess without it that he saw things instantly and in a flash—that they stood out for him in outline and colour and movement there and then. That is plain, as we study them, in the parables drawn from nature, and here it is confirmed. The rest of the scene comes, one may guess, from memories of Herod and other personages with retinues seen on the trunk road near Nazareth—and it is curious to note how these impressed him, for they recur, even to the clothes, oftener than we should have expected in the fragments of his talk that survive for us. "I was seeing Satan fallen from heaven," he says to the disciples on their return from their first preaching expedition—what the imperfect tense in the first verb implies, I do not yet see; the aorist participle surely fits in with "in a moment of time." Is it vision,—or an imaginative picture of what that preaching expedition had meant? In any case, it is a picture seen, and given again in a sentence of the shortest. Lastly, at the end, Jesus tells Peter that

Satan "pushed to get you (pl.) for the asking," but "I prayed for thee"—a picture not unlike those in Job and in Zechariah where Satan plays a part. Again, is it vision, or an imaginative picture of the soul in peril, the reality of the danger, the forces that contend before God, and (by implication, thank God!) the victory of the prayers of Jesus?

Finally, let us remind ourselves of the many parables and pictures and sayings which put God Himself before us. Two must serve here—the picture of God keeping count of the little birds in the nest and missing the one that falls out, and the story of the incredible creditor who forgives his debtors with such a grace and charm (ἐχαρίσατο) that they do not hate him for the favour he does but love him, and (I believe it would follow if we had some more of the story) pay him the debt in the long run and love him more than ever for the way in which he takes it. When one studies the teaching of Jesus, God somehow becomes real and delightful, in a most wonderful way.

So far we have been taking instances of the actual way in which Jesus does things, how (in our phrase) he handles his material, what he sees of it, what he makes of it. And now, for modern people cannot keep away very long from abstract nouns—such faithful disciples are we of the Greek philosophers and of Cicero—let us try to sum up the qualities of mind that seem to be indicated by the manner of speech which we have been considering. We may begin with the very close observation that underlies all the scenes from nature, an observation that needs no note book, that is hardly conscious of itself. There is, as we know, a happy type of person who sees without looking—and sees aright, too, and yet we never saw him look. How is it done? The opening books of *The Prelude* will give us a clue to this as well as anything else. There it is, however—one man looks and misses, the other sees without noticing and sur-

prises us by what he has captured—and does not realize yet what he has done. It is "by peculiar grace." Just this faculty we find in the historical Jesus of Nazareth, but it is not a thing merely to be registered and laid by. With it goes habitually a deeper sympathy than most of us know. To be brief, the study of Wordsworth's mind will help us materially to understand this aspect of Jesus. Observation and sympathy—the quick look that sees in a flash—vivid imagination and humour; they are all among his gifts and faculties; and above all a unique instinct for going to the real and basing himself on the real—and this gives him his authority. All great religious teachers, all real leaders, as Carlyle has shown, have some such gifts in greater or less measure. Why should one dwell on it in the case of Jesus, then?

My answer is, seriously, this. We have not taken Jesus in earnest.

We know him as a figure in a book, a Person in a dogma, much as the scribes knew Moses and Moses' commentators. We do not make of him what we might. Here is a teacher indeed for modern men. We must have facts, we must build on the real. Here is a man who did it, who drove his disciples into the real, insisted on the open mind, the study of fact, the fresh keen eye turned on the actual doings of God. "Go and tell John" —what? Simply what you hear and what you see. There will be no sign for the Pharisees—why not? Because people who are not serious with reality never see signs at all, and would not recognize them if they did. When you want to forecast the weather—who can do it for you that does not know the sky and its signs by instinct? And instinct is the outcome of intimacy. "Wise master-mariners," said Pindar, "know the wind that shall blow two days hence, and are not wrecked for greed of gain." Why cannot men take things in earnest? Jesus asks.

Now a step forward in what has been designed for an argument. We fail to make what we might—and what

we ought—of Jesus for want of attention. We are bound, as men, in any case to grapple with the highest and truest we find; and we let it alone. "What is the good of going to church, when we know about God already?" a child asked. The fact is, we do *not* know Jesus Christ, and lazily take theories about him, sometimes very poor, thin theories, sometimes great and splendid theories with vast and wonderful histories—but little we have in Jesus that is ours. Any real movement, any real awakening, that is to come in the Christian Church must be from a new contact with him; and for us today, with scientific and humanistic habits of mind, Jesus must be approached on the human side. So far we are in the same position as his earliest disciples—compelled by our training to come at Jesus in the natural way of friendship and intimacy. And then we find—if what I have been trying to set out is right—a type of mind amazing in its grasp of reality, whatever the region in which it is occupied—birds, men, business, the imagination, everywhere. I say again—it is autobiography—we have not taken Jesus in earnest.

Suppose that we did take Jesus in earnest, and by strenuous endeavour to get out of the traditional, by sympathy and every other gift of understanding we possess, we grappled with his words (let us begin there) till every term he uses gleams and lives for us with all the wealth of content and meaning that he put into it. We should be beginning then to reach some means of understanding him. And then, when we had grasped the fact that he did use words with meaning, if we went on to see what he really said about God, what would follow? We use abstract nouns about God—providence, divine goodness, fatherhood, and so on—he did not. What a guarantee we have in his serious and real use of ordinary words, in his gift for reality, that when he speaks of God, he means what he says. That is what we find so desperately hard to understand. But when

we begin to take it in, we shall be not far from the Kingdom of God.

And what did he say about himself? Not very much, it may be. Perhaps he did not need. So far as one can see, God's real things do not talk about themselves. You can miss the sun day after day, and the stars every night—inattention can shut you off from the real in a hundred ways. But when men begin to be in earnest about Jesus Christ—well, what else did he ask, or could he ask? What happens is, that they find in him more than they expected, and give him names that they never imagined they could—and they do.

There is of course another way—probably many—but one Melanchthon pointed out: "This it is to know Christ—not to contemplate his natures, the modes of his incarnation—but to receive what he gives."

The unexplored factor in the Gospel is Jesus Christ.

Thomas Atkinson

By Joseph Blount Cheshire, D.D.
Bishop of North Carolina.

The third Bishop of the Diocese of North Carolina has a permanent place in the religious history of our country. At a critical moment he stood for peace and good will and Christian unity, based on mutual confidence and love, rather than on compromise or formal agreements; and though he was by no means alone in that position, yet circumstances seemed to make the issue depend largely on his action, and the force of his mind and the simple greatness of his character went a great way in making his course really decisive of the result. That the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States came together in harmony and in mutual confidence and love in 1865, immediately after the War between the States, was largely due to his action. This may seem to have been of importance only to one comparatively small Christian communion. But in the situation of public affairs at the time it was of no small significance in the life of the country, and, in view of the present interest in the subject of Christian Unity, it assumes even greater significance and value. It was the great work of a great man, and justifies us in seeking to know something of his life and character.

Real greatness and goodness are confined to no station, nor are they wholly unattainable in any circumstances. But often they find no field for their proper exercise and development. Sometimes, however, under most adverse conditions, a man will seize upon the smallest things of

an obscure station and a narrow experience, and by the force of an indomitable purpose achieve greatness, moral and intellectual power creating opportunity and commanding success. And again, we shall see a serene and lofty nature, moving quietly along its appointed way, going from strength to strength, gathering breadth and depth and power in seemingly unconscious and tranquil development, until in God's providence a great crisis of danger or of opportunity confronts it, and is bravely met and adequately dealt with:—and the man is revealed. He is indeed happy whose great endowments of heart and of mind find in the experience of life opportunities for full development, and whose highest and best qualities are called out in the service of his country and his fellows. Such was the case with Thomas Atkinson.

Few men have exerted a more beneficent influence at critical and decisive moments upon questions vitally affecting the Church, and through the Church the best interests of the country at large. While yet a presbyter he successfully asserted and maintained at a crucial juncture the just rights and functions of the Episcopal order. He was himself called to the Episcopate to sustain a Diocese shaken by the defection and desertion of its Bishop. In the fierce outbreak of civil strife his serene spirit and masterful intellect enabled him, with but little sympathy or appreciation even from his brethren, to hold up in view of all the true distinction between ecclesiastical and civil duties. When peace was restored, his voice brought into unity the separated Dioceses; and he stands forth in the new order for full and equal privileges to all races in the reunited Church.

The sixth of eleven children, he was born August 6th, 1807, at his father's place, "Mansfield," in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, near Petersburg, the son of Robert Atkinson and Mary Tabb Mayo his wife. His connections were all with the best and most distinguished families of Virginia. Singularly happy in all his domestic

relationships, he saw all his brothers and sisters grow up to maturity in mutual affection and confidence, and all attain social and professional distinction in their several spheres of life.

He was of an old Church of England family, and was as an infant baptized in that Church, of which his parents continued faithful and devout members. But it was a day of great weakness, and was only just ceasing to be a period of decay and disintegration, for the remnant of the old Colonial Church of Virginia. The material ruin wrought by the havoc of the Revolution, the desecration and destruction, the impoverishment and abandonment, of so many of its churches and parishes, the reduction in the number of its clergy from ninety-one, at the beginning of that war, to twenty-eight at the close, were in the end probably lesser evils than those which flowed from the failure of its own members to realize fully its essentially spiritual character, and the impossibility of maintaining it in free America upon any other basis. There were good and able men among the few remaining clergy. But they were more or less "*anachronisms*," out of date, as we say. They represented the ideas, the methods, the aspirations, of a past age. The new life which had stirred the dry bones of Eighteenth Century coldness and irreligion, showing itself first in the great Wesleyan revival, and then in varying forms, mostly extravagant, sometimes violent and irrational, but a real and vital movement in almost all parts of the country, was most distasteful, and often quite incomprehensible and shocking, to men brought up on a religious diet of South or Tillotson, of Beveridge and Bull. A Devereux Jarratt here, and a Joseph Pilmore there, might show exceptional appreciation of the pressing needs of the hour, but no adequate change, or real adaptation to the new situation, could be expected from men whose characters had been formed, and their mental attitude fixed, before the beginning of the Revolution. And by the results

of that Revolution all supplies of younger men and fresh intelligence had been cut off for a long and distressing season.

During this period of decay, and then of slow revival, the people of the old Colonial Church found themselves attracted by religious teachers more open to the new spirit and necessities of the times. And especially were the better educated among them impressed by the able and spiritually-minded Presbyterian divines of that day. In the Colonial parishes the services of the Prayer Book had been but imperfectly followed, and were therefore imperfectly known, and often but little appreciated. Eloquent preaching was more esteemed than reverent worship. The conditions of American life hardly allowed a consistent following of the devotional system of the Prayer Book in its entirety. A missionary of the S.P.G., who had to serve half a dozen scattered churches and chapels, could not carry out the prescribed services in any of them. It is not surprising then to find, after the Revolution, that even the most loyal members of the Church in many parts of the country had but a slight hold upon its principles and an imperfect acquaintance with its ways.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was but beginning to emerge from this sad condition when Robert Atkinson, of "Mansfield," was bringing up his notable family of six sons and five daughters. At this time two able, eloquent and godly Presbyterian ministers, the Rev. John H. Rice and the Rev. Benj. H. Rice, exercised a wide influence throughout Virginia and the neighbouring States. Robert Atkinson, though a faithful communicant of his old parish, frequently attended with his family the preaching of the Rev. Benj. H. Rice, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Petersburg. Three of his six sons, under the influence of Dr. Rice, joined the Presbyterian Church, and all became in time eminent Presbyterian ministers. Some of the daughters also be-

came Presbyterians under the same influence. This domestic situation was not without an important influence upon the future Bishop. His close and intimate contact and experience with a divergent form of Christian doctrine, worship, and character, could not fail to bring into clearer consciousness those elements of religious truth which retained the unshaken loyalty of his opening heart and mind. And also the experience of religious differences, in a family circle where mutual love and confidence remained unbroken and undisturbed, must have had no small part in producing that breadth of sympathy, serenity of temper, and just discrimination in judgment, which were among the most notable qualities of his character.

He was graduated from Hampden-Sidney College, Va., with high distinction in 1825, and having studied under that very eminent lawyer, Judge Henry St. George Tucker, was admitted to the bar in 1828. About the same time he married, and, taking up his residence on a plantation in Lunenburg County, began the practice of his profession. It was not uncommon in the South at that day for eminent professional men thus to combine country and professional life. The South was still almost wholly rural in its ideals and tastes. And so young Mr. Atkinson lived on his plantation, as long as he continued at the bar, directing the labour of his slaves, and administering his domestic affairs in the intervals between the terms of Court.

He was not a rich man. Few Southern planters of that day were very rich. Their most valuable possessions were their slaves, and of all forms of wealth this was probably the least exposed to the ordinary temptations of wealth. The net pecuniary returns from slave labour were small; and in the care of their slaves were involved duties and obligations not to be avoided by upright and conscientious men. The relation in which they stood to their slaves developed habits of command and a kind

of masterfulness of character, but also gave them a sense of responsibility, which tended to make them serious and earnest men. They were as a rule simple in their habits, robust and hardy, living much out of doors and on horseback, interested in public affairs, and responsive to all community obligations whether social or charitable. It is a fact not commonly remembered that the Virginia gentleman of the first part of the Nineteenth Century was very near to being an abolitionist. An effort about 1830 to enact a scheme of gradual emancipation in Virginia is said to have failed by only one vote; and that it failed was due to the infinite complexities and difficulties of the subject. These efforts commanded the hearty sympathy of our young Lunenburg planter and lawyer; and eventually he freed all his own slaves, who were willing to remove to a free State, keeping only such as preferred to remain in Virginia as his slaves to becoming free in a strange community. He was conscientiously determined to do all in his power for the best interests of those whom Providence had made dependent on him, and felt quite sure that they were in a better condition in Virginia as slaves than as free negroes in a slave State. He had no scruples as to holding slaves in the South under the circumstances of the time. The strength and independence of his mind and the sanity of his judgment, in these opening years of his manhood, made him equally opposed, on the one hand, to those who would plunge the country into strife and bloodshed in a violent and premature effort to abolish slavery, without regard to law or justice; and, on the other hand, to those who would perpetuate slavery at the cost of the disruption of the Union of the States and the ruin of the country.

His natural solidity of character and clarity of intellectual and moral vision, were strengthened and developed by the study and practice of the Common Law, a system of jurisprudence which, however lacking in the theoretical symmetry and logical consistency of the Civil Law,

was admirably adapted to the circumstances of a free and self-governing people, as tending to develop a spirit of personal independence and self-reliance in the individual, combined with a respect for the rights of others, and for the common interests of all. It was not doubted by any who knew him that his talents specially fitted him for success in the highest branches of the Law; and to the end of his life it was a common thought to all lawyers who heard him preach, that a great advocate and a noble judge had been lost to the profession.

Warmed by the diffusive love and piety of Richard Channing Moore, and stimulated by the spiritual and intellectual vigour of William Meade, his successor, the old Church in Virginia was putting on new strength; and, among others of the best of her sons, Thomas Atkinson found his heart turned toward the Holy Ministry. He was ordained by Bishop Moore, Deacon in 1836, and Priest in 1837, and served during his Diaconate in St. Paul's Church, Norfolk, and then for six years as rector of St. Paul's, Lynchburg.

But it was not in his native State that he was to find his real work. He had come into the Ministry with well-defined convictions as to the doctrinal and historical position of the Church, and not with a mere sentiment in favour of its worship and polity. His early and familiar contact with the vigorous Calvinism of the Southern Presbyterians had given him a clear view of his own convictions, and he had thoroughly examined his theological foundations. His legal studies had opened to him, in their connection with the development of English institutions, the essential continuity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America with the historical Church of England, reaching back to the earliest Christian ages. He had come to be a Churchman of very distinct principles, principles somewhat different from those then current in Virginia. With the Rev. Nicholas Cobbs, of Petersburg, he represented the working of a new spirit in

the old Diocese. But in 1843 he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, and in the Diocese of Maryland his clear view of essential principles, his sound judgment, and vigour of intellectual leadership, soon brought him into prominence, and made him one of the first men in the Church, and so recognized in all parts of the country.

In Maryland, as in all the Thirteen Colonies, especially where the Church of England had received legal recognition and support, the lack of Bishops had produced practical congregationalism in parochial administration, and it was very difficult, when Dioceses had been organized and Bishops consecrated, to bring the parishes into any really Episcopal methods of government. Natural conservatism and suspicion of an unaccustomed authority combined to resist any change. The Diocese of South Carolina came into union with the General Convention, with an express *proviso,* that no Bishop should be established in that State. And when the first Bishop was elected it was with the declared purpose of having a Bishop who could ordain men to the Ministry, so that the Diocese might withdraw from union with the other Dioceses, as it would not consent that the House of Bishops should have an equal voice with the Clerical and Lay Deputies in legislation. And Bishop Smith had not even a seat in the Diocesan Convention of South Carolina, except as a *delegate elected by the vestry of St. Philip's*, of which he continued to be the rector.

Before 1850, however, the general intelligence and loyalty of Churchmen, had to a very great extent remedied these early difficulties, but there remained in many quarters a rooted reluctance to recognize any kind of Episcopal authority, even of a purely pastoral character, within the parish. This contention culminated, and issue was joined on the question, in the Diocesan Convention of Maryland in 1850. The vigorous administration of Bishop Whittingham had been developing something like

a real Episcopal polity, to the general satisfaction of his clergy and people. But his modest and wholly just and lawful exercise of Episcopal functions in his visitations was met, especially in the case of one or two eminent rectors of large parishes in the Diocese, by strong and determined opposition, which went so far as to deny that the Bishop could administer a sacrament, or preach, or so much as read the scriptures, in a parish Church, except by the permission of the rector. In the final and decisive conflict over this question in the Diocesan Convention, Dr. Atkinson was the able leader of those who sustained the rights of the Episcopate. As Chairman of the Committee appointed to consider the question he presented to the Convention, and eloquently and successfully supported in the ensuing debate, a report in which the questions at issue were most ably, temperately, and lucidly discussed. With sound judicial discrimination he passed by the minutiae of canonical and rubrical regulations, and based his argument upon those underlying principles, which the Canons and rubrics everywhere recognize and illustrate; and, while carefully safeguarding the just rights and privileges of the local clergy, he showed how the Episcopal function has its proper exercise in parochial and pastoral ministrations, no less than in diocesan administration and government. This report was adopted in the Convention by an overwhelming majority, and went far towards settling the question in all the other Dioceses throughout the country. But that no uncertainty might longer remain in so important a matter, the Convention prepared a Memorial to the General Convention of 1850, asking for definite action by that body. This Memorial gave rise to a prolonged and animated contest in the House of Deputies, in which Dr. Atkinson led the debate in support of the Memorial. The result may be seen in a canon enacted by that General Convention, recognizing the right of the Bishop to exercise his proper pastoral function in visitations to the congregations of his Diocese.

In the meantime he had been twice chosen Bishop of Indiana, first in 1843, and again in 1846, but felt constrained to decline in both cases.

On October 17th, 1853, he was consecrated Bishop of the Diocese of North Carolina, as successor of Bishop Ives, who had become a member of the Roman Catholic Church. Earlier in the same year he would have been chosen as Bishop by the Convention in South Carolina, but for a letter written by him to a member of that Convention, saying that if it came to an issue between slavery and the preservation of the Union, he should favour the abolition of slavery. His declination of the election to Indiana in 1846 was because he could not sympathize with the violence of the abolition sentiment in that State. He was, therefore, in the singular position of having failed of an election in South Carolina, because he was not sufficiently favourable to slavery, and of having declined the election in Indiana because he was not sufficiently opposed to it. In both cases he preferred his honest freedom of mind to the honourable advancement within his reach.

The critical situation of the Diocese of North Carolina appealed to his sense of duty. Bishop Ravenscroft, like himself a Virginian, and at one time also a resident of Lunenburg County, had laid the foundations of the Diocese in those religious and ecclesiastical principles to which his own convictions so strongly adhered. Bishop Ives had begun his work along the same lines. His defection had discredited his own early teaching, and had made people suspicious of even the well-settled principles of the Church. Great anxiety was felt as to the effect of his action, not that others were expected to follow him, for before his departure from the Diocese he had almost entirely dissipated his personal influence even upon those who stood nearest to him, but it was feared that the depression and discouragement of the people would greatly hinder the efforts of his successor. But with the coming of Bishop Atkinson all such anxieties at once

vanished. His presence commanded instant confidence, and inspired courage and hope.

"A broader character and a more capacious intelligence than Ravenscroft's, yet with all of Ravenscroft's immovable weight of principle and loyalty to the Church; a sounder judgment, a more accurate discrimination, a more serene and lofty spirit, than was found in Ives, yet with a logical power, a moral sincerity, and a spiritual force in the pulpit, which commanded respect and attention equal, if not in the end superior, to the best efforts of his predecessor's best oratory;—all these made the third Bishop of North Carolina a man raised up by God for the emergency, and specially fitted for the necessities of that critical time. . . . In an instant perfect confidence was restored, hope revived, and the life of the Diocese went forward, under the influence of a calm, earnest, clear-headed, single-hearted leader, in whom all recognized a man called of God to be an Apostle in His Church."

It was in the War of 1861–5 that his full strength and greatness appeared. The Southern Bishops of that day were a very remarkable group of men. No one can doubt this who recalls the names of William Meade, James Otey, Leonidas Polk, and Stephen Elliott. The Bishop of North Carolina was much their junior in the Episcopate, but the unprecedented emergency placed him at once in the front rank. And before the troubles of that time were over he stood above them all in that wisdom which is not dimmed by the clouds of passion, and in leadership which not only sees the right, but attains it. Both at the beginning of those sad days, and at their close, he was forced to stand alone, or almost alone, in judgment and in action, separated from those he most loved and revered, and strongly holding his Diocese to the true course, as he saw it, against the feelings of his own people, but upheld by their confidence in his wisdom and goodness; and in the end recognized by all as the pilot who had guided the ship into the harbour of safety.

Upon the Secession of the Southern States, in 1861, the Southern Bishops, almost without exception, held that the civil and political disruption of the country had *ipso facto* created a corresponding division in the Church, and that *upon ecclesiastical principles* a separate organiza-

tion was necessary for the Southern Dioceses. In one way or another, with amazing differences of theory and of reasoning, they all managed to arrive safe and satisfied at this common conclusion. The intense spirit of nationality evoked by the opening events of the war and by the formation of the new government, "*The Confederate States of America*," so powerfully appealed to their imagination, that it bore them along with it, and bent them to its service.

It was much the same at the North, with opposite results. It seemed to be assumed by Bishops, Church papers, and Conventions, Diocesan and General, that, because in their view no legal separation had been effected between the sections, therefore there could be no rightful ecclesiastical separation. In both cases it was assumed that the civil and political situation necessarily determined the ecclesiastical *status*. Nearly a century of separation between Church and State had not freed them from the unsound traditions of a national Church somehow inseparably bound up with the unity of the Nation.

The Bishop of North Carolina was of a different spirit. In political, as in ecclesiastical, principles he did not differ essentially from his brethren. But he held his principles in a different way. There was in him no confusion of thought, no haste or perturbation of spirit, no clouding of intellectual vision by the heat and passion of the hour. And there was no conscious or *unconscious* compromising of the highest ideal of loyalty to the Church, and to his divine commission as a Bishop in the Church, to meet the supposed necessities of the hour, or the passions, prejudices, or interests of himself or of others, many or few. In this moment of intense popular excitement and intolerant public opinion, he, now as always, subordinated every personal, local, and national feeling and interest to his high conception of the freedom of the Church, and its superiority, *within its proper sphere*, to all worldly concerns and institutions. He could not acquiesce in the

view which made the integrity of its organization, its obligations, its internal structure and relations, dependent on the politics of warring parties and States. He asserted the right of the Church to determine for itself these essentials to its very existence, and to amend, alter, or abolish them, by its own proper will, and by its own untrammelled action, without interference from the State. And what the State had no right to effect by direct intervention, he held not to have been effected indirectly and incidentally by purely political action, not designed or intended to affect the Church in any way. He himself favoured a separate organization of the Southern Dioceses. He recognized the fact of the state of war, and the actual separation; and he saw that the resulting conditions could be met only by separate organization. But it must be the spontaneous action of the Dioceses themselves. He held the union between the Dioceses North and South to be unbroken, until, for some urgent necessity, the Southern Dioceses by orderly conciliar action should withdraw from that connection, and effect a new organization with proper constitutional and canonical regulations for the life and work of the Church. In his own case that was accomplished in May, 1862, when he and his Diocese, in Convention assembled, accepted and ratified the Constitution of the "*Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States.*"

This position, plainly set forth and eloquently and irrefutably maintained in his addresses to his Conventions of 1861 and 1862, subjected him to no little misunderstanding and misrepresentation. He felt keenly the attitude of some of his brethren and friends towards him on account of these views. But such were his convictions, and upon them he acted as well as spoke. In January, 1862, he gave his canonical consent, as being yet in connection with the Church in the United States, to the consecration of Bishop Stevens, of Pennsylvania; and in March, 1862, he declined to take part, with Bishops

whom he most deeply loved and revered, in the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Richard H. Wilmer, Bishop-Elect of Alabama.

The moral courage and magnanimity implied in these two actions can not be at all estimated by those who do not remember the intensity of feeling and the intolerant public opinion of those fierce days. Even his own Standing Committee shrank from his side, and declined to act upon the case of Bishop Stevens, but gave their canonical consent to the Consecration of Bishop Wilmer. None of these things moved him; nor did they disturb the serene temper of one who in his large and generous nature was satisfied to suffer, so he could feel sure that he was right. He was as confident, as were any of his brethren, in the permanent establishment of the Confederate States. He had no thought that his position of isolation on this question, so unpopular and so painful at the time, would ever be of advantage to his reputation and influence. But, though his position was little appreciated or approved, it had even then its influence, and in the organization of the Church in the Confederate States nothing was said about the political rupture making ecclesiastical separation necessary; and the action of the Southern Dioceses was explained and justified upon the simple ground of such an actual division as rendered their organization a practical necessity. And it should also be mentioned, in honour of that short-lived Southern Church, that in its records can be found no word of bitterness, anger, or ill-will. Those faded pages breathe an unvarying spirit of peace, charity, and good will to all. The men of the South may have been not better than other men, but when they came together in the Church of Christ they were able to possess their souls, and to think and speak as becometh the Children of Light.

Peace came in the summer of 1865. The South lay prostrate and bleeding. Strife had ceased, but the waters of hate and variance had not ceased to swell, and

no one could tell what kind of union had been restored. There were possibilities of ill-will, suspicion, and distrust, darkening the future prospects of the country, like angry clouds upon the horizon. Every religious body in the Country, whose bond of union was domestic and not foreign, stood apart, North and South, continuing and reanimating the spirit of mutual antagonism. The question most deeply concerning the whole country was—How to bring together the divided people? Many hearts on both sides longed and prayed for a renewal of love and confidence. Who could effect it? How could it be brought about?

Again one calm, clear, confident, loving voice is heard. He who had stood for the freedom of the Church in the angry storm of 1861, still testified to that same freedom, and invoked it for the restoration of peace and love between separated brethren. It is not to be denied that many others were like-minded with him. But also it cannot be denied that it was the voice of the Bishop of North Carolina which spoke, fuller, clearer, more persuasive than any other; and that it was his appeal which commanded attention, North and South, and which stirred a responsive movement in the heart of the Church.

Those were weighty words which he addressed to his Diocesan Convention in September, 1865:

"The authority of the government of the United States is reestablished over the South, and there is a universal disclaimer of any intention or desire to attempt to unsettle it. But it is very far from being certain what the nature of the Union is to be, which has been cemented with so much blood. Is it to be one of constraint, or one of affection? Is the South to be added to the melancholy list of oppressed nationalities,—to become an American Poland or Hungary, to live by the side of the North in a state of chronic turbulence, suspicious and suspected, hating and hated? A doom so mournful and so humiliating is certainly not to be desired. Can it be avoided? To me it seems very much to depend upon the Ministers of Religion. They have a great deal to do in moulding the sentiments of a people. . . . It is then of cardinal importance to the peace and welfare of the country, that there should be a reunion of the different religious denominations which now have distinct organizations at the North and South. But I believe it to be per-

fectly evident that if this is to take place, it must begin with the Episcopal Church. If that can not, or will not, reunite, none can or will. We separated from the force of outward circumstances without discord, without crimination or recrimination; on the contrary, with the language of love on our lips, and, I trust and believe, with the feeling of love in our hearts."

Most of his brethren in the Southern Dioceses agreed with him in desiring eventual reunion. Only the Bishop of South Carolina seems to have contemplated a perpetuation of the separate organization. But their desire was to negotiate terms and conditions of reunion before returning to their places in the General Convention. This course the Bishop of North Carolina feared, as promising an indefinite continuance of alienation and discord. By standing apart, he did not believe that the cause of union could be furthered. Conscious of the integrity of their purpose and the propriety of their action, he felt that the Southern Bishops and Dioceses should take their places in the General Convention about to meet in Philadelphia, assuming that they would be met by their Northern brethren in the same spirit of confidence and affection.

There were few in the South who could rise to this pitch of confidence. Bishop Johns, of Virginia, could, but he could not command the co-operation of his Convention. In the Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina Bishop Atkinson encountered strong opposition, led by so great and good a man as the Rev. Dr. Watson, afterwards Bishop of East Carolina, himself a man of Northern birth and education. But his hand for twelve years had held the helm of his Diocese, and his people knew him for a pilot to be trusted in every storm. They yielded to his judgment, and with a full representation, Bishop, Presbyters, and Laymen, the Diocese of North Carolina was present at the General Convention, the first week in October, 1865.

Other men from the South were at that Convention, men as good and as true as any. The day after Bishop

Atkinson's arrival came his kinsman, Bishop Lay, of Arkansas. He had been in thorough accord with the Bishop of North Carolina, and had joined in his first letter to the other Southern Bishops, urging immediate reunion. There were delegates from Texas and from Tennessee, though the Diocese of Tennessee had not united with the Church in the Confederate States. But none of these occupied the commanding position of the Bishop of North Carolina, and all looked to him to speak the decisive word. In all the history of the Church in the United States perhaps no other man ever held in his hands the clue out of so perplexing a maze of difficulties. With his Diocese he stood before the Convention, not formally, but virtually, representing, as only a Diocese in its organic completeness could represent, the Southern Church; bravely putting behind them the memories of strife and division; with clear consciences as to their course during the period of separation; ready to restore the broken unity, and to be brothers again in visible communion, as they had never ceased to be in spiritual fellowship. And then, with whatever of momentary irresolution and doubt, the Churchmen of the North nobly justified the confidence which their Southern brethren had shown. Bishop Atkinson and Bishop Lay were present, but they delayed the formal resumption of their seats in the House of Bishops until that House should give them some intimation of its purpose as to their absent brethren. The breach was practically healed, and the desire of their hearts assured, when the House of Bishops sent one of its most honoured members, to ask them, in the name of all the Bishops, to return, and "*to trust to their honour and love.*" It was to them as a word spoken out of their own hearts. They at once resumed their places; and the confidence inspired by their presence, and especially the wisdom and the wonderful discrimination and judgment of Bishop Atkinson in framing the critical resolution upon which at one time

the preservation of mutual concord seemed to depend, guided the Convention safely through the delicate details, which attended the completion of that reunion.

No more of that story can be told here. Nor is it possible to follow to its close that noble and useful life. Fifteen years longer he administered his Diocese, and sat in four General Conventions after 1865. In 1868 all the Southern Bishops and Dioceses had returned and renewed their proper influence and activity in the Church. And among them all the Bishop of North Carolina continued the most honoured and beloved, and most influential on all great questions affecting the interests of the Church. He never put himself forward. No man was ever more wholly free from hungering after advantage or distinction or influence. But the demands of duty and of difficulty had shown him to be a man of wisdom and power, and when he rose to speak among the Bishops no man spoke with more authority and acceptance.

Something must be said of his attitude towards the negroes after Emancipation. He had in his youth performed his full duty towards his own slaves, as he saw it, without regard to his pecuniary interests. From the beginning of his Episcopate he was most solicitous for their spiritual nurture and welfare. No sooner had they been emancipated than he made it one of his chief labours to improve their educational advantages, and to secure for them the benefits of the worship and communion of the Church. Again we recognize his high conception of the freedom of the Church, and its superiority to secular interests and prejudices, in his encouragement of young coloured men to prepare for the Ministry, and in his care to guard the rights and privileges of the coloured members of the Church. It was on account of his endeavours in this direction that "St. Augustine's Normal School and Collegiate Institute" was established at Raleigh in 1867; and the North Carolina Dioceses are, so far as the writer is informed, the only Southern

Dioceses having any considerable number of coloured clergy and congregations, where the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese make no distinction of race or colour, and white and coloured clergy and laity sit in the Convention upon exactly the same terms.

As few men have played a more important and beneficent part in the history of the communion in which he was so distinguished a character, so, few men have been more admired and loved. In person he was strikingly handsome, of noble presence, and commanding form, with a face which might truly be called beautiful, though in a high degree expressive of manly character and intellectual power; and of a sweetness and gentleness of demeanour to win the ready confidence of the most timid. And, with all this, of a visible serenity of spirit, not to be shaken by any gust of passion.

The few who still remember him think of him as one of the most interesting, edifying, and impressive preachers they have ever known. He spoke the Word with power. He did not disdain the aids of rhetoric and the graces of oratorical adornment. He simply never thought of them. He moved in a sphere above them. He had deep and earnest convictions of truth, and a vivid sense of the love and goodness of God, with an inner experience of Christian grace and power; and out of his ripe experience and ample stores of knowledge he taught his people the great things of truth and duty. An able and acute critic, who knew him well, said of him:

"He was a great *lawyer*-Bishop, capable of drawing with masterly ability the logical sequence from an admitted premise, with the unblenching gaze of very high moral courage:—with great charm of personality, and great attractiveness as a preacher."

Very much of his work must be left unnoticed, for above all else he was a pastor, the shepherd of his flock. We have only noticed him in his more public and general relations. The most important part taken by him in the life of the Church and the country in general, is

expressed in the inscription upon the corner-stone of a little church erected to his memory in Charlotte, N. C.

"BEATI PACIFICI:
QUONIAM FILII DEI VOCABUNTUR."

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

A Constructive Sketch of St. John the Divine

By The Most Reverend Evdokim,
Russian Archbishop of North America.[1]

He that is not against you is for you.

It is beyond any doubt that the teaching of our Saviour influenced the Apostle John profoundly. But what was this teaching? What were the positive features that characterized it? What was the relation in which St. John stood to our Saviour?

The sun ray is always the same in colour as in essence, yet we only very seldom see it as such. It is the same in essence, yet it undergoes considerable changes in the mediums through which it has to pass. Thus it is not to be doubted that the teaching of the Saviour differed in its influence on His disciples, being reflected differently in their consciousness.

[1]Translated by Vera Johnston.

Many people have attempted to answer this very important question at various times. In the opinion of some, St. John was a youth whose beauty was not of this world. His face was unusually gentle, almost womanly in its tenderness. He had pensive, beautiful eyes; his light hair came down on his shoulders in long curls, and a profound inner calm shone in all his features: in his presence people felt profoundly peaceful, and it was enough to see St. John but a few times to feel a profound affection and sympathy towards him. So quiet, gentle, and restful was he: no breath of earthly tempests ever affected him in the least. His heart was filled with infinite tenderness towards the Saviour. He followed Him everywhere, always intensely attentive; always with his eyes on His heavenly features, fearing to miss a single word from His lips, he listened to His conversation and His preaching: the profound wisdom of the Teacher evoked the most enthusiastic feelings, filling his heart with warm affection and unreserved devotion.

Such was the ardent image of John depicted by certain writers and Christian artists. This wonderful outward image drew the sympathetic attention of every man, but only for a few moments. As soon as one looked more attentively, one could not help seeing in this image many features which we could by no means relate to the soul of St. John. For this outward image was a wonderful apparition, a fairylike vision, rather than the John whom the Saviour loved. This was not the John, known from the New Testament, from the first three evangelists, from the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the Epistles. No, St. John the Apostle was unlike this image: from his earliest years we see him, in the midst of all the privations of the desert, following an ascetic of unusual severity who reminded all who knew him of the Prophet Elijah of the Old Testament. Comparatively speaking, the image depicted by the brush of Domenicino was a better likeness. This painter after long and careful attempts to penetrate

the secret springs of the soul was able to record only one characteristic trait of St. John—the great depth of his contemplative nature. The painter pictured him in the process of writing, his face eagerly serious, his earnest eyes turned towards heaven, to the kingdom of everlasting truth and life, forgetful of the world and its vanities. No cares of this life could ever penetrate such a soul, or mar the peace which filled it. His spirit soared undivided in the lofty abodes beyond the clouds, above the stars; he stood at the very throne of eternal truth. It would seem that our partial human understanding was a thing of the past with him; that he had reached the period of direct vision. Not by any efforts of guessing, not through a glass darkly, did he behold his visions, but immediately, directly, face to face. The genius of Raphael has left us an image of a wise man, reposing on the wings of an eagle, and contemplating heavenly beauties above our conception.

Neither was St. John a man of unblemished perfection, free from all failings or weaknesses. These failings were only natural, for on leaving their homes the disciples of Christ still carried their defects with them. No man can be free from all sin: the great Apostle John himself, on reaching the supreme wisdom, said, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and there is no truth in us." Together with his co-disciples he failed to understand the teaching of Christ. Many a time the Saviour turned towards them, asking in wonder, Do you still fail to understand? Once the apostles disputed as to which of them was the greatest; often, when alone, they attempted to interpret among themselves this or that saying, this or that parable of the Saviour. They did not dare always to ask for an explanation directly from the Master Himself; there was much that they failed to understand altogether. They failed to understand the prophecies of the Saviour, how He should be delivered into the hands of the heathen, who would jeer at Him, insult Him, spit at

Him, and beat Him to death, and how He would rise on the third day. John was able to believe in the resurrection only after he had entered the sepulchre and failed to find the body of his Master. And even after leaving the empty tomb St. Peter was still in doubt as to what had happened: the kingdom of the Messiah had been represented in such a material way that men expected it to be outwardly realized at any time. Let us remember the three chosen disciples, St. John among their number, in the Garden of Gethsemane; whilst the soul of the Saviour was torn by such suffering that to support Him throughout it a luminous angel came down from heaven, these three could not conquer their desire to sleep.

It was not always that John acted and spoke wisely, separating himself from the other apostles; and more than once actions that were not quite thoughtful drew on him words of tender reproach from the Saviour. This is the way the Saviour solved the perplexity of His disciples. He declared to them that he who wishes to be first is to be the least and the servant of all; then He took a little child and placing it before the disciples said, "He who receives one of these in my name receives me." Like the rays of the sun which penetrating a house instantly illumine its every corner, these words of the Saviour shed an astoundingly clear light on one of His acts; St. John understood that he had taken part in something which deserved the blame of the Teacher. "Master," said John, to the Saviour, on another occasion, "we saw a man who exorcises daemons in thy name, yet he does not walk with us." John, together with other disciples, forbade him to exorcise daemons in the name of Christ; he forbade the mention of the beloved name. This man was not an apostle; he was not even openly a disciple and follower of the Master, so thought John; therefore he ought not to be allowed to work miracles. The power to exorcise impure spirits, to heal all sickness and every weakness was granted by the Master to them alone. And this is

how the Master answered His favorite disciple: "Forbid him not for he who is not against you is for you." The Lord never asked of any one more than he could do; everyone was to work according to his strength. Thus every good act, however minute, was still good, and not bad. He who fulfilled the least of the Lord's commandments was in spiritual communion with the Lord and helped the building of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. All who received any man in the name of Christ received Christ Himself. Every one giving a cup of cold water to a traveller will have his reward. And if in the eyes of the Lord such a small offering as a cup of cold water had such a high price, was not the gift of exorcising evil spirits to be valued at a higher price? A man possessing such a gift might not have walked with the disciples of the Saviour; he might not have belonged to the outward community of the followers of Christ; but in essence he already in part belonged to this community; he was on the way to the Light and Truth, and it would not have been easy to lead Him to join the enemies of Christ. Possibly there might come a time when he would completely join Him, becoming a disciple of the Saviour himself. Moreover, Christ and the community of His followers were surrounded by enemies who for ever tried to hinder Him, and this man not only did not hinder but helped the spread of the glory of the name of Christ and the increase of His disciples; and if so, would it have been just to forbid him to work miracles in the name of Christ? Would it not amount to working against themselves, and having the kingdom divided within itself? And so, who is not against you is for you. St. John remembered well the majesty of this lesson, so touching in its tenderness, the spirit of which many fail to understand, even to this day. Can not we hear the echo of this lesson in St. John's chief commandment which he was so fond of repeating towards the end of his life,—the commandment of love towards every man? And is not this lesson at the

foundation of his pastoral zeal worthy of all admiration?

And here is another instance of St. John taking to heart a lesson coming from his Master: the Saviour was setting out for one of the important feasts in Jerusalem, perhaps it was His last Passover, or the feast of Tabernacles, also in the last year of His ministry. Disciples and numerous followers walked with the Saviour; gradually they were joined by pilgrims walking also towards Jerusalem to attend this feast. This time Christ chose the shortest way from Galilee to Judaea which passed through Samaria. The first day of the journey was coming to an end; the pilgrims had passed through Galilee and were approaching Samaria. It was time to seek food and shelter for the night. Moreover, it was very possible, as subsequent events proved, that the Samaritans might refuse hospitality to Jews out of hatred. The Saviour foresaw this and accordingly sent some of His disciples to the nearest Samaritan village to gain the kindly disposition of the Samaritans and prepare a friendly reception. We may take it that in this case the village of En-Hannin was meant. Pilgrims from Galilee often stopped there for the night on their way to Jerusalem. Possibly because the mutual relations between the Jews and the Samaritans were especially strained at this time, the Samaritans refused admission to the pilgrims, and so the tired-out travellers had to walk to another village seeking shelter. The inhabitants of this village refused shelter to those who were on the way to Jerusalem with the object of praying in the Temple which was inhabited by God Himself, the Master of all the world. They learned of this cruel act of the Samaritans with heavy hearts. And their hearts grew still heavier when they remembered to Whom the Samaritans were refusing shelter. This party of pilgrims was led by Christ and those who surrounded Him would have followed Him anywhere. In the eyes of all He was a great prophet Whom

God had sent to His people. His three disciples, Peter, James and John, were still under the recent impression of the vision they had beheld on the Mount of Transfiguration. They recalled that their Master was the true Messiah Whose coming had so long been eagerly expected, Who was to found His glorious kingdom on earth and bring comfort to the suffering. In such significant days all men should be ready to lay everything at the feet of Christ: their possessions and their strength. Therefore, what should be the punishment of those who refused even to give Him shelter for one night!

Filled with reflections of this kind, St. John also remembered an event which happened close by, in the same locality. Ahaziah, the King of Samaria, had sent a captain of fifty with his soldiers to take Elijah and bring him to the King's palace by force, if he would not go of his own free will. The messengers laughed at the prophet, and in accordance with Elijah's prayer fire came down from heaven, consuming the first and the second captains of fifty so that none was spared. On another occasion, the Lord rained brimstone and fire on the wicked cities on the plain of Sidon, destroying all the inhabitants and everything that grew on the ground. If Elijah brought down the fire from heaven, the Master, who was greater than Elijah, should do so only the more. As soon as this idea arose in the mind of John, he hastened to realize it, and, approaching the Master with his brother James, said: "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them as Elijah did?" Their anger against the Samaritans was so great that they did not even think to ask the Master to bring down the fire, but intended to do it themselves. They had worked miracles before this when preaching the coming of the Messiah in Palestine: therefore they thought they were capable of working a miracle on this occasion also, if the Master wished it. Thus the sons of Zebedee intended to act, being moved by the deepest affection and deepest devo-

tion to the Saviour. Their words clearly harmonized with the Old Testament view in which they were brought up, and which demanded an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. James and John meant to act on this impulse. They did not realize as yet that the days of Elijah were of the past, that the spirit of Elijah was not the spirit of Christ: they had not learned as yet the lesson we read at present on every page of the New Testament—"The wrath of man does not work for the righteousness of God."

Well aware of the true motives of His ardent disciples, the Saviour did not attempt to explain how profoundly in error they were; He did not point out to them that they were moved by their present mood of irritation and aggression; He did not disclose the secret motives of their hatred of the Samaritans, which brought about their demand. Neither did the Saviour wish to arouse in them compassion towards those whom they wished to be consumed by the fire of heaven. He simply said to them: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." How much was said in these few words, and what profound wisdom was contained in them! It is as if the Saviour said: I did not come that sinners should perish, but that they might be saved; those who are well need not a physician. By what means then can a sinner be saved? No fire could avail for this, and, even were heaven and earth to be wrapt in the most dreadful of fires, were the ground to open and swallow them, this also would not avail in the least. All the calamities and misfortunes you could bring down on them could not reform them. Consumed by the fire, or swallowed up by the earth, they would go down to their graves in the same moral condition in which they lived on earth. But possibly there will come a time when their eyes will open, when they will learn the truth and be converted. The Son of Man does not wish that any sinner should perish but that he should repent. On the other hand, a virtue

imposed by force has no value in the eyes of God. Being forced to do good in one way or another, or doing it for his own interest, man really remains the same in his soul as he was before. An evil man remains as evil and a brigand remains the same brigand. The enemies of Christ should not be oppressed and persecuted for fear that they may destroy the truth. Christ has no enemies. Truth is not endangered by darkness because it contains within itself its best proof. No darkness can engulf it.

Such was the lesson of infinite tenderness and tolerance towards all sinners. It sank deep into the soul of St. John. And later on, not a word of reproach ever came from St. John's lips concerning sinners, whatever depths of error or perversion of truth they were guilty of. St. John merely warned his flock against such people. But his tolerance was so great that from reading the writings in which he warns his spiritual children against heretics, it is impossible to decide who precisely were the heretics he meant. After this incident, St. John never could think again that it was his duty to call down fire from heaven upon sinners.

Yet there was another occasion when John and his brother James acted separately from the other apostles, and once more heard a gentle reproach from their beloved Teacher. This happened at a very significant time of the earthly life of our Saviour. For three years the Saviour had been working openly in the service of humanity. During these three years thousands of people believed in Him, but many hated Him and of late there were some who were determined to kill Him, so that it became impossible for Him to walk openly among the Jews. The time of the Paschal Feast was approaching, and in spite of the danger He was sure to incur in Jerusalem, the Saviour joined His friends and walked towards Jerusalem once more to take part in the great Paschal celebrations. This was His last visit to Jerusalem. The Saviour foresaw that He would never return there. A few days longer,

and His public work which lasted a little more than three years was to come to an end. Anticipating His visit to Jerusalem in imagination, the heavenly Teacher experienced many moods influenced by various thoughts and reflections. The interior tension was reflected outwardly also: It was as if He were surrounded by a halo of suffering and the mood of the Teacher was communicated to His disciples. In confusion and great fear, they timidly walked after Him. Once more the Saviour spoke to His disciples about His coming suffering, His martyrdom and His death, and once more the disciples failed to understand Him. John also did not understand and, indeed, was it possible for them to understand that any one could have power to hurt Him, Who healed every illness and every weakness, Who exorcised impure spirits, Who gave back life to the dead, Who ordered the winds and the seas? All the people bore witness that no one performed such miracles except their Teacher. They all unanimously confessed that He was a great Prophet sent to earth by God Himself: of course, He need speak but one word, and whatever the number of His enemies, they would all be dispersed. If of yore the ground opened and swallowed Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with more than ten thousand of those who shared their views, would it not swallow whoever raised his hand against the Saviour, at a single word from Him? Yet was He not speaking of suffering in store for Him? How were they to reconcile this with His preaching of the Kingdom of God on earth? Had He not preached this for more than three years in word and in deed? How then was to be fulfilled this solemn promise He had so recently given them? Did He not say that there would come a time when the Son of Man should sit on the throne of His glory, when the Twelve also should sit on their own thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, together with Him? Quite the contrary, it seemed as if the whole disclosure of His glorious kingdom on earth was about to be realized.

Influenced by these thoughts, John and James decided that they would ask for something from their Teacher. They were perfectly aware that they were going to ask for much, and so they tarried, hesitating to speak. First, they asked the Saviour whether He would grant them what they asked, and only after this, did they put their demand in words. This was also the reason that they made their mother Salome ask for the same thing, and it is obvious that she insistently begged Him to help her sons: "Master, grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory." Yet the impulse that moved James and John in this case was not entirely due to egotism and base ambition. It was not as if they wanted to secure places secretly and deceitfully which really belonged to others. Their motive was chiefly their most profound affection and devotion to the Saviour. Certainly it is part of great affection that he who loves wants never to part from the beloved. Love gives us the strength to follow those whom we love, going through terrible martyrdom, suffering and even death for their sakes. The Saviour doubtless understood the true motive of John and his brother, and so He did not denounce them, but said with much gentleness and tenderness: "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Giving utterance to this request, John and James thought of the brilliancy, the power, the glory of the future kingdom of Christ. This they thought the nature of that kingdom. Yet in the above quoted words the Saviour gave them a true idea of His kingdom, telling them that whoever wished to be a member of this kingdom must be prepared to drink the cup of suffering and sorrow. Only he was a good warrior, who was able to drink this cup to the dregs. The only way to the glorious throne of Christ which John and James had in view lay through suffering. To approach this kingdom meant to pass through fire and sword.

Thus one of the most ancient Christian traditions formulates an unwritten saying of Christ; it is as if the Christ said, "You think of honours and crowns, but I speak of deeds of self-sacrifice and labour before you; the time of rewards is not yet, and my glory is not to be disclosed so soon; the present time is the time of danger, struggle and death." In the kingdom of heaven there is no room for ambitions, prerogatives, and egotistical rivalry. There we shall see no regarding of persons but only the reign of justice and love. We are all equally redeemed; we all have the same right to be first, and this is the reason why many of the last shall be first here, and many of the first shall be last. Among the heathen the mighty are masters over their subordinates, and the magnates over their slaves; but in the kingdom of Christ it is just the other way; the greatest and the chiefest is to be everybody's servant and slave. Then only John and James were compelled to understand how profoundly unjust they had been, and how misplaced was their request. After this they never thought of sitting, one on the right side, and the other on the left side, of their Saviour. Not one of the evangelists contains any reference to their asking for this again, and after the Ascension of the Saviour they never thought of it any more.

These few events do not exhaust the records of the inner and outer life of John the Apostle. Neither do they define completely his relation with Christ. They impart to us an idea of the two or three characteristic features of St. John which, moreover, are fragmentary and have no organic bond with each other. They really do not give any idea of the most characteristic features of this apostle, belonging to him alone. If we consider only these three or four occurrences, we shall be entirely unable to distinguish him with any precision and clearness from his brother apostles. Yet he is distinctly different from them. As every star has its own glory, shining differently from the other stars, so St. John graphically stands out

in the midst of the other apostles. His soul was marked by many unusual, entirely original qualities, to such an extent that St. John could never be mistaken for anyone else. He alone among the twelve apostles, among the seventy, among the many thousands of people, was called the Beloved Disciple of the Saviour. He alone was the chosen from among the chosen. Then what were the characteristic features of John the Apostle?

Those who investigate this matter are at the outset astounded at the remarkable scarcity of information concerning the life and activities of St. John among the New Testament writers. This great apostle remains throughout it all in the shadow. He takes a second place, not only when Peter or others of the apostles are concerned, but even when the mere hearers of Christ are meant. When reading the Gospels we all lose sight of him as if forgetting that he ever walked with Christ, as if he had lived far from Him, in seclusion, apart from all the rest. Sacred writers have left us but a few lines concerning St. John which bear on his life in any direct way. So far as we know directly from the Synoptics, John spoke during the earthly life of the Lord only two or three times directly to Him, and only on one occasion did he speak to Him alone. The first time we hear from St. John himself that he and his co-workers had forbidden a man who was not a follower of Christ to exorcise daemons. The second time together with his brother James he suggested to Christ that they should bring down fire from heaven on the inhabitants of one of the villages of Samaria. The third time, again in company with his brother James, he asked the Saviour to promise them a place on the right and on the left side of His throne. This is all we gather concerning St. John from the Synoptics. This information is so scanty that at the first sight one cannot help wondering whether the Synoptics were intentionally silent concerning John the Apostle. In his own Gospel St. John hardly gives more information concerning himself. He simply

transmits to us three short sentences spoken by him on different occasions. They are the following: "Rabbi (which is to say, Master), where abidest thou?", "Lord, who is it?" "This is the Lord!" Of these questions the first most probably belongs to St. Andrew, in whose company St. John was at the time; the second, was addressed to the Saviour by St. John because St. Peter insisted that he should do so. St. John speaks as little of his deeds, and whenever he mentions them the mention is extremely laconic. At the simple statement of St. John the Baptist, "This is the Lamb of God", St. John the Evangelist left the forerunner without a word and without hesitation. John has not recorded a single word about the feelings and reflections with which he left his first teacher. During the three years in which he followed the Saviour, St. John gives us but one impression of himself: silently, quietly, without perturbation, he followed his heavenly Teacher throughout all his travels. It would seem as if not a single word, not a single deed of the Master passed unnoticed by St. John. He saw and heard everything.

It is impossible to suppose that it was by mere chance that the evangelists have preserved for us so little information concerning the personality of John the Apostle. The comparative silence of the evangelists concerning John which was noticed by everyone was the result of the peculiar quality of his soul. It is because of this that anyone who wrote the Gospels could not depict the life and activity of John the Apostle in any other way than that in which it has been depicted. How are we then to explain the scantiness of information? It cannot be explained on the ground of his own sluggishness, immobility, or lack of receptivity. The few incidents of the life of John transmitted to us by sacred writers disclose above any doubt that John's soul was in the highest degree fervent, eager and impulsive. His usually peaceful and quiet ways were at times interrupted by the most tempestuous outbreaks. It is true that the storm never

lasted long, yet these incidents were intensely strong. He responded to certain phenomena with the quickness, the strength, and irresistibility of lightning. The Saviour found Himself obliged, not to awaken or develop the sensitiveness of John, but to temper, to soften, to limit, and to spiritualize it. Silently, quietly and calmly, John followed Christ together with his brother apostles; never making himself conspicuous, he listened to the talks of Christ, he witnessed the enthusiasm of the people, and it would seem that there was nothing on earth that could disturb his continually peaceful mood. Then, suddenly, it was gone. When the Samaritans of a small village, owing to their national prejudice, refused to shelter some tired pilgrims at the head of whom walked Christ, John was excited to such wrath that his wish was to be allowed by the Saviour to bring down on this village fire from heaven. He wanted to punish this refusal by burning human beings, the houses in which they lived, and the cattle they owned. He never gave a thought to the hundreds of little innocent children who might perish with the adults. In his excess of tempestuous anger John forgot that God had promised to the Patriarch Abraham to spare every town with not less than ten righteous people. He also forgot that God spared Nineveh for the sake of those who could not distinguish their right hand from their left, even for the sake of the blameless cattle which were to perish in the cataclysm. The same fieriness of John's soul is described in his narration of his meeting with the man who exorcised evil spirits through the name of Christ, without being His disciple or wishing to follow Him. This was more than the fiery, impulsive John could bear. As a natural outcome of his feeling John demanded either that this stranger should join them or that he should be made to cease from speaking the gracious name of Jesus in exorcising daemons. No other alternatives were possible. The same fieriness of St. John's soul was manifest in the demand of the sons of Zebedee concerning the

places they should be awarded in the future glorious kingdom of Christ, one on the right hand and the other on the left of the throne. This desire of theirs was so fervent and so overpowering that they forgot their brother apostles who also might have wished to occupy these places. Still less did they think of the rest of humanity, each of whom might have been first in the kingdom of Christ as had been stated by Christ Himself. They did not attempt in those moments to peer into their own souls and to question whether they deserved these places.

The Saviour gave the name of Peter to one of His disciples for his uncommon firmness and endurance. This disciple was like a rock well able to weather any storm or tempest. This was the distinctive characteristic of his soul. On the other hand, the brothers James and John were called by the Lord, Boanerges, the sons of thunder, the figure being borrowed from nature, and this comparison made it possible for the Saviour to penetrate into and express the most secret recesses of John's soul. As the air always contains electricity, so the breast of St. John always contained a potent spiritual fire. It is not often that unusually terrific storms break, likewise it was not often that the blinding radiance of the spiritual fire of St. John's soul broke through and shone outwardly. St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Epiphanius, the blessed Theophylact, St. Ambrosius of Mediolanum, the blessed Jerome, and others suppose that Christ gave these names to John and James with the purpose of recording the fact that their teaching would be especially exalted, powerful and irresistible in influencing the hearts and minds of all men. The power of this word would remind men of the fire which spares no one and nothing, destroying whole cities and great villages, immense forests, hundreds of people and animals. No man would be able to resist the power of this word. And it could not be otherwise, for the irresistibly powerful word

comes only from the lips of him whose very thought is made of fire. No one ever heard, no one will hear such a word from a man who is apathetic and hard to move, indifferent to everything that goes on around him. Our apostle himself brings witness that he never belonged to people of that class, that he never had anything in common with them. Unusual fieriness and impulsiveness were always the essential and constant characteristics of St. John's soul. The fieriness which we observe in John the youth was always manifest in John the adult and John the white-haired old man. Thus the character of St. John contained two entirely different, even opposite, qualities: on the one hand, a remarkable fieriness and impetuosity, and on the other, the striking rarity of the occasions when the overpowering fire of his soul became manifest, though it always burned in his breast. It was in these qualities of his soul that St. John was clearly distinct from other apostles. And it is these two opposite qualities that enable us to reproduce the majestic spiritual image of St. John the Apostle almost in its entirety.

Yet these features of St. John's character are only seemingly contradictory. In reality they were organically bound to each other and bore witness to one and the same thing. The same power of the spirit was manifest on these occasions. The unusual limitation of the exterior activities in St. John's life leads us to suppose that his was rather an inner life, theoretical and contemplative, than exterior and practically active. That which we merely presuppose on the basis of the first of the above-named qualities we are logically bound to confirm in view of the second of these qualities. And, indeed, in order to be able to respond to certain phenomena, as John responded to them, it was necessary to have lived through a good deal, to have thought and felt much, to be as fiery and impetuous as he. This is entirely obvious on the occasions when John stood out from the rank of the other apostles and acted alone. What are, therefore, the

individual features characteristic of the life of people like him? What is the essence of their life? What is their attitude towards all that surrounds them?

People of this type are entirely different from the people who possess the ability to be practically active. In order to understand all the depths of this difference and the essence of the contemplative soul it would be enough to draw a comparison between St. John and St. Peter. The latter was of a remarkably active and practical disposition. None among the chosen apostles of Christ was distinguished by as great quickness and animation in responding to all the phenomena and events which came from the outside. When the others still hesitated and discussed what their course should be, St. Peter had made his choice long ago and acted on it, attempting to realize every idea of his without any delay. Always and everywhere he permitted feeling to guide him, as feeling is the most powerful and irresistible motive power in man. This is why St. Peter always preceded all the other apostles in the expression of thoughts and feelings they all shared. This is why the evangelists give so much more information about this particular apostle. The quickness with which the enthusiasm of St. Peter was always ready to blaze up in his entire readiness to sacrifice himself was the real cause of the irresistible greatness of this apostle and his superiority over the others. It is owing to this quality of his soul that he was able to be both a great exterior worker and a builder of the order of life of the first Christians. With the exception of the Apostle of the Gentiles, none was so necessary as Peter whenever something was to be built or arranged. If we examine history we shall find that all the great political and religious workers, all the organizers of great communities, and all the great practical workers, were always endowed with characters like St. Peter's. Yet people of this type have their failings also. Led in their activity rather by feeling than by reason, they often fail in correctly estimating and

measuring all the details. Sometimes it happens that they act altogether rashly. With all the sincerity of his heart St. Peter devotes himself to Christ and confesses in the name of all the apostles that this is truly the Christ, the Son of the living God. But very soon after this he shows himself guilty of an entirely misplaced zeal in dissuading the Saviour from accepting the cross which was truly necessary for the salvation of men. He shows as little judgment on the Mount of Transfiguration when offering to build several tabernacles in order to retain materially the bliss which they had just experienced. On beholding the Saviour walking over the waters of the Sea of Gennesaret, without a moment's hesitation, Peter also steps out upon the water and walks on it for a short while as if it were dry land; then his faith begins to waver and, feeling that he is drowning, he asks the Saviour for help: "O, Lord, save me!" When before the Last Supper Christ washed the feet of His disciples, once more Peter failed to understand the well-known saying of the Saviour, and answered with profound sincerity, "Lord, dost thou wash my feet? . . Thou shalt never wash my feet." And on hearing what the Lord said to him, he as readily answered, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." When, not long before He was taken by the guards, Christ said, in the Garden of Gethsemane, that during this night all must be tempted, St. Peter, with the greatest sincerity, announced, "Even if I must die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." And indeed we see that, when the guards surrounded Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, Peter drew his sword and used it, ready to lay down his life for the Master. But very soon after this came the lamentable fall, when, later on, a simple servant girl asked him, "Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean?" St. Peter was so confused and frightened that he denied all knowledge of the Saviour. And, that people should believe his word, he swore and called God to witness that he did not know this man.

Three times the same question was addressed to him in different forms, and three times Peter gave a negative answer. Yet when, having denied Christ for the third time, he heard the cock crow, his action stood before his mind in bold relief and in a single moment he understood how deeply he had fallen. Later on, we see him again in the company of Christ, when, beholding the Teacher standing on the shore of the lake, Peter jumped into the water, giving himself no time to throw off his clothes, and swam in order to be the sooner with the Teacher. The few minutes that the boat would take to bring him to land seemed too long for him. And even after the Ascension of the Saviour the same impetuous inclination to act under the influence of the moment led St. Peter into many subsequent perplexities.

But St. John was quite different. He never responded to impressions from without as precipitately as St. Peter. Contemplatives like St. John have developed into great philosophers, scientists, poets and artists, through all the past history of humanity. The reason is not difficult to understand. People given to thought, people who theorize and contemplate, by their very natures are prevented from embracing any exterior career. Hence they are never brilliant workers in the eyes of the masses. This is why they always remain unnoticed, lost in the crowd, and why the brilliancy of other people often hides them from us. But, finding no forcible expression outwardly, they are only the more clear and strong in the fervour of their inner souls. The natural element in which contemplative people can soar, to which is turned or directed their whole attention, is pre-eminently the inner spiritual world, the region of ideas where ideals reign supreme. Of such was St. John.

Some Points Recently Gained in the Study of the Epistle to the Romans

By Père M. J. Lagrange.

It is surely in the spirit of The Constructive Quarterly to fix the points on which critics are in agreement. The fact is not so common that it is not worth noticing. I take for example the studies on the Epistle to the Romans. The subject is without doubt abstract enough, and its discussion requires sustained attention, but is not the attention of the Christian public attracted to that splendid *chef-d'œuvre* of the Faith at a time when Protestant Germany is about to make arrangements, upon the conclusion of peace, to celebrate the centenary of the Reformation which Luther so deliberately rested upon the Epistle to the Romans.

It is not, then, as it seems to me, inappropriate to indicate the points upon which an agreement is henceforward established, and upon which at least it is sure, as we think, to become more and more solid, and more and more universal. These points concern: 1st. The date of the Epistle; 2d. The doctrinal position of the Romans; 3d. Literary character; whether Epistle or Letter.

I. The Date of the Epistle to the Romans.

Everyone is agreed that the Epistle was written from Corinth, neither is there any doubt as to its date in relation to the Apostolic career of Paul. Paul's first sojourn at Corinth lasted one year and six months (Acts XVIII, 1 sqq.), during which he appeared before

the Proconsul Gallio (Acts XVIII, 12 sqq.). He returned to Greece and spent three months there during the winter preceding his journey to Jerusalem (Acts XX, 20). By all appearances, he sojourned then at Corinth, and it was during a second stay that he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. In fact he tells us in that Epistle (Rom. XV, 25) that he is going to Jerusalem to carry thither the Alms of Macedonia and Achaia.

But, the relative date once established, what are we to think of the absolute date—the date expressed in the current chronology? Until recent times we possessed but one point of departure, the date of the inauguration of Porcius Festus, Procurator of Judea, who, upon his arrival at Caesarea, found Paul in prison, where he had been for two years (Acts XXIV, 27). Now Paul had been arrested in Jerusalem soon after his second stay at Corinth.

But this point of departure was itself difficult to fix, and the learned hesitated between two systems. Harnack favored A.D. 56; Schürer, A.D. 60. Between these two authorities one might hesitate, the reasons being inconclusive for either side.

But we now have a more solid starting-point. An inscription from Delphi, published by M. Bourguet, has reference to Gallio, Proconsul of Achaia, before whom St. Paul appeared after his first sojourn at Corinth. The upshot of M. Brassac's very precise discussion is that Gallio was in Achaia from the spring of the year 51 to the next following spring.[1] Paul, who remained a certain time, altogether one year and six months, at Corinth after his arraignment (Acts XVIII, 18), probably left the city at the same time as the Proconsul, or soon after, to avoid renewed attacks from the Jews—say, in the summer of the year 52. He was at Antioch in the autumn and could commence, in the spring of the year 53, his third great mission (Acts

[1] *Revue biblique*, 1913, January and April.

XXIII, 23). We must, therefore, place his journey into Phrygia and Galatia, a stay at Ephesus of three months, then of two years (Acts XIX, 22), then a brief time (Acts XIX, 22), after which he returned to Greece. This was the time of his second sojourning at Corinth. Four years suffice for this third mission, perhaps even three years, for Phrygia and Galatia are only mentioned in the account of the Acts. So that Paul could have been at Corinth during the winter of the year 57 or even 56.

We cannot, then, be far wrong in placing the composition of the Epistle to the Romans in the winter of 56, or, at the latest, the winter of A.D. 57. M. Harnack's short chronology is, therefore, finally disposed of. But it is none the less wonderful that Christian doctrine should have so full and so substantial a form at a period so near to the Passion of Jesus Christ, of which it sets forth the value to all humanity, both Jews and Gentiles.

II. THE DOCTRINAL POSITION OF THE ROMANS.

Were the Romans to whom Paul wrote of Jewish origin for the most part, or were the majority of the Faithful from among the Gentiles? And, supposing that the Gentiles were the more numerous, were they not imbued with Judaic opinions, thinking themselves obliged to practise the Law? These two questions have long been controverted. The extreme opinions were those of Baur, who believed the Roman Church to have been penetrated by a Judaic spirit, and that of the Jesuit Cornely, who did not admit that St. Paul ever had the intention of reforming any abuses in it. Intermediate opinions were not wanting, and M. Godet, in his commentary, has thought himself obliged to enumerate about sixty authors,[2] almost all of whose solutions differ by some shades. I will leave them to the preferences of readers of this Review, and I do

[2] Godet, *Commentaire*, I, 110.

not pretend that all controversy is henceforward at an end. I only say that two arguments ought to be eliminated from the controversy, and these are almost the only ones which justified any conclusion to the Judaizing spirit of the Roman Church.

The first of these arguments is a proof from tradition. There is, in fact, no doubt but what many ecclesiastical writers have affirmed that the Roman Church, founded by Jews, had preserved Judaizing sentiments even to the time of Paul. The important thing, as in all questions of tradition, was, to get back to the source. Was the first writer who noted the fact in a position to know about it? Was he a direct witness, or at least in possession of historical recollections? Or was he giving as a tradition what was only a conjecture?

The most ancient is the commentator known under the name of Ambrosiaster. His personality is still shrouded in mystery. Dom Germanus Morin had proposed to recognize in him the Jewish convert Isaac. He now prefers Evagrios of Antioch. However that may be, this author is revealed to us as one preoccupied to a degree very rare among the ancients in what we call historical exegesis. He seeks to give some account of the facts which led to the intervention of Paul, and at the beginning of the fifth century he does not hesitate to say that it is considered as settled that the Church of Rome was founded by Jews, and by Jews who did not even confess the Divinity of the Christ. With still better reason did these first Christians believe themselves bound to practise the Jewish Law.

This conclusion, under so absolute a form, did not inspire much confidence, but in the end a great many adhered to it.

We now know the origin of these reports, which were so troublesome to the Roman Church; we know clearly that Ambrosiaster, as well as many another one, is only the echo of Marcion. This important discovery must

be credited to Dom de Bruyne, a Belgian Benedictine.[3] M. Corssen arrived at the same conclusion independently, but he has given full credit[4] to his predecessor's perspicacity, and their conclusions are registered in the splendid Latin edition of the Epistle to the Romans published by Wordsworth and White.

Dom de Bruyne has in fact discovered the author of certain very ancient prologues which were handed down with the manuscripts of the Vulgate, and to which enough attention had never been given. This author was no other than the heretic Marcion who was condemned, as we know, by the Roman Church because he exaggerated the Pauline doctrines, or, rather, because he utterly caricatured them, to the point of not admitting that the God of the New Testament was the same as the God of the Jews. It was Marcion who wrote: "The Romans inhabit Italy. They were imbued with prejudices by false Apostles, and brought to the Law and the Prophets in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostle calls them back to the True Faith, writing to them from Corinth."

In thus expressing himself Marcion was quite in keeping with his character, but his affirmation is too interested to deceive anyone. The fact is palpable that he had no historical information. He reasons like one who dogmatizes, and dogmatizes misunderstanding the faith of St. Paul as well as that of the Roman Church.

Those who shall continue to maintain that the Roman Church was Judaizing must have recourse to other sources of information than those texts which repeat the impudent assertion of Marcion and to other arguments, drawn from the Epistle itself.

To this, as we well know, modern criticism had devoted itself. Truth to tell, the opinion of Baur, much

[3] *Prologues bibliques d'origine marcionite* in the *Revue bénédictine*, 1907, p. 1 sq.

[4] *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1909, pp. 1–45.

like that of Marcion, has been abandoned. And yet Renan was still writing that Paul knew the Church of Rome "much attached to Judaism"[5] and Lipsius, an excellent commentator so far as concerns philology, has sustained, with more moderation, a thesis to which he has given verisimilitude by that very moderation.

The Jews of Rome, says Lipsius,[6] were Hellenists, of a less narrow spirit than those of the East, and those among them who became converted to Christianity were just those who were animated with broader ideas. They had given up obliging the Gentiles who became Christians to be circumcised; they were very tolerant as to the ceremonial part of the Law, but they thought themselves obliged to follow it, above all as a juridical rule, being deeply imbued with the consciousness of their privileges. They had been able to impose their views upon the Gentiles. Paul could not give his adhesion to this conception of the Christian Faith, but it seemed to him that Judaeo-Christians of this kind could be reasoned with and brought to sentiments more in conformity with his own.

And the principal proof given by Lipsius and all those who think with him is that Paul in fact reasons with real adversaries who are bringing up objections against him. Many texts bring them into action or, rather, place the words in their mouths. For instance: "What, then, are the prerogatives of the Jews, or what availeth circumcision?" (III, 1) one of these Judaizers would ask Paul, irritated at seeing himself put on the same footing as the Gentiles. Or again: "What shall we say, then, that Abraham, our father according to the flesh, hath obtained" (IV, 1); "What shall we say, then? Is the Law sin" (VII, 7); "That which is good, hath it been for me a cause of death?" (VII, 13) etc.[7] In all these cases, it is said, the discussion is too heated, the tone

[5] *St. Paul*, 12mo, ed., p. 462. [6] In Holtzmann's *Handkommentar*.
[7] Cf. III, 31; VI, 1, 15; IX, 14, 19, 30; XI, 1, 11.

too animated for a mere academic tilt. Paul is not speaking only *of* the Judaizers but *to* the Judaizers; they dominated the Roman Church at that time.

Now it must be admitted that this argument has lost a great deal of its value, I will even go so far as to say, all its value since the important studies of M. Norden[8] and M. Bultmann[9] on the style of the *diatribe*—that is to say, of Cynico-stoic preaching such as it was in the Graeco-Roman world.

Bion of Borysthenes, at the beginning of the third century B. C., was one of the founders of this *genre*. One of his characteristic features was the intervention of a fictitious personage who made the objection. The preacher who introduced the dialogue in his exposition wishes, so to speak, to force his auditor into a discussion with him. Also, he would address him, whether in the plural or by preference in the singular, because the discussion is more natural with one person alone. This manner being once admitted, not only in sermons but in regular treatises, the turns used by St. Paul are easily explained. Without doubt he argues with warmth, because the subject is so near his heart, and he wishes to follow his opponents into their inmost intrenchments. But those adversaries cannot be the Romans, whose faith he praises (I, 8), to whom he speaks with so touching a cordiality (XV, 25 sqq.). In the same way, these pretended adversaries have no personality. The formulae put in their mouth are interrogations in the air, calculated only to connect the parts of the argument and give it more life. Unless we are altogether mistaken, here again is a point which may be considered as gained.

III. LITERARY CHARACTER: EPISTLE OR LETTER.

We should say something here about the positive progress attained by criticism as to the literary *genre*

[8] *Die antike Kunstprosa: Agnostos Theos.*
[9] *Der Stil der Paulinischer Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe.*

of the Epistle to the Romans. We must agree, however, that the results are less well assured and, so to speak, less tangible. The question has recently been put by M. Deissmann, and he does not hesitate to pronounce his opinion very categorically. According to him the Epistle to the Romans is not an epistle, but a letter.

The discussion has its starting-point at the discovery of a number of letters upon the papyrus. Until quite recently we have not known much of any ancient letters except some literary compositions. Assuredly the letters of Cicero to Atticus and to his other friends are altogether letters, very different from the letters of Seneca to Lucilius, which are rather little treatises. But Cicero never lays aside the orator, even with his intimate friends, whilst we possess a mass of letters, written from day to day, without any literary pretention, having for their aim the disposal of business, the arrangement of pending situations, or the expression of intimate feelings. It is, therefore, easy for us to distinguish between the two types: that of *epistles*, treating of subjects with a permanent interest—little dissertations, with literary pretensions,—and that of *letters* properly so called. M. Deissmann boldly places the Epistles of St. Paul in the second category; they would not have become epistles but for the veneration which they inspired.[10]

The question of the character of the epistle, however, must not become a question of words. If it is good to distinguish between literary forms, this, too, must be in order to place by themselves certain cases which do not enter into any well-defined category.

We should first recognize that the work is really a letter. Paul is writing to the Romans, and, if he did hope that his letter read by others would be useful to them, still it is to the community of Rome that he addresses himself, and for its benefit. He knows, at least in a general way, what is happening at Rome, and gives

[10] Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 166.

appropriate advice, particularly in regard to morals. He has, moreover, a special reason for writing to the Romans: he has long desired to see them, and, his journey being still postponed, he does not wish to put off getting into touch with them any longer. He has come to a particular and solemn moment in his career. Casting his eyes over the past, he does himself the justice—or rather, gives so much honor to the grace of Jesus Christ—of saying that he has finished his course in the East. He hastens to complete it with Jerusalem, to put the seal upon the tie that binds him with the saints of Judaism. He now aspires to make a conquest of Spain. If he is not ambitious to conquer Rome itself, it is because the process of evangelization is already progressing well there. But then the Romans can help in the new task. He counts on them, and he tells them so (Rom. XV, 24): these are exactly the circumstances of time and place which characterize a letter; here, too, we find the expression of personal sentiments between the writer and those to whom he writes. Add to this, as indicating the private letter, the polite forms at the beginning, in the style of the papyrus, the salutations at the end, containing so many names of individuals.

And it is no injustice to the Epistle to the Romans if we do not classify it as literature. Paul was certainly not thinking of giving pleasure by his ingenious exposition of ideas, or by discovering happy turns of expression. He who speaks is a missionary, an apostle; he warms to his theme, he lets his heart speak, opens his soul as one does in a letter in which one is sure of being understood; and, if he expounds speculative verities, it is because they ought to be, for the Romans, light and truth. This is no affair of treating an ethical theme, after the manner of the epistle of Seneca to Lucilius, or of performing that part in literature Cicero did not refuse to perform in the letters to Atticus.

The Epistle to the Romans, then, is altogether a letter.

But no one can prevent its constituting at the same time a body of theology. We will not attempt here to determine its subject, but, whatever it may be precisely, it certainly is a piece of dogmatic teaching with a general bearing. If we find no other like it—we will not say, in literature, but in the writings of antiquity—we must simply conclude that this work has a character peculiar to itself. So that, if the name of *epistles* is reserved for letters which stand out from the mass of personal and familiar correspondence, we must continue to call this The Epistle to the Romans.

But we are not obliged to regard the letter to the Romans as a treatise which had no more concern with them than with others, for such a writing would no longer be a letter.

We shall, therefore, have to settle upon some mean in the way of a solution.

In a matter of this kind one ordinarily makes the distinction, and rightly, between the occasion and the object. As to the occasion, everyone is agreed: Paul wished to prepare the Romans for his visit. But the object? The object, he himself said, was, to accomplish his ministry among the Gentiles (Rom. XV, 15 sq.). But what connection, after all, was there between the object and the theme chosen? It is here that the occasion affords us some light. Paul, as we have said, was preparing to inaugurate his mission in new regions. The entrance to the mysterious confines of the Western world was Rome, which, at the same time, through the Greek language spoken there, was the boundary of the East; or, rather, it was the Mistress, the arbiter of the destinies, of the East and of the West. It was very important for Paul that it should perfectly understand his doctrine. His gospel was that of the Apostles, but he more than anyone had preached the grace of Jesus Christ, the uselessness of the Law, and, for that very reason, he had been the butt of passionate attacks not

only on the part of the Jews who had remained Jews, but also on the part of the converted Jews. After his first controversies, the heat of which is already reflected in the letter to the Galatians, he had had time to ripen his doctrine. How could he do otherwise than seek to expound it to the faithful in its full dimensions? But perhaps he had never fulfilled that desire. The occasion presented itself to him. Since he was to enter into relations with the Romans, to ask of them something like support in still more distant regions, was it not appropriate to present to them his doctrine at the same time as his person? The letter is nowise polemic, since it is not addressed to adversaries; it is in nowise apologetic, because Paul is not thinking of defending himself personally, save in that measure in which the exposition of the truth is the best apology of one whom others have laid under suspicion of error. It is an instruction addressed to the Romans, which well suited their position; it is a letter, but a letter treating the subject which was of the greatest importance for the entire Christian world.

One might also point out, as an example in illustration of textual criticism, some points determined by criticism. What we have said will perhaps suffice to show how useful is the tentative of The Constructive Quarterly to place in relief that which unites rather than that which divides.

Jerusalem - Paris.

On the Soul of the Church of Sweden

By Nathan Söderblom, D.D.,
Archbishop of Upsala.[1]

Is not the soul more than the body? Is not the life more than the raiment? In Western Christendom there were several souls to a certain degree tolerated in spite of their dissimilarity. It is conceivable that the modernists of the Roman Catholic Church look back with wistful eyes upon the Middle Ages when, notwithstanding the Inquisition and the burning of heretics, a scope was left to the work of thought and to the different types of religious life that was narrowed when the Churches of the Protestant confessions came into existence, and Roman Catholicism became more and more sharply defined. It was no deliberate breadth of view, still less tolerance in the modern sense, but rather a lack of discrimination, that suffered during the Middle Ages discrepancy of thought and doctrine. It was then as now true, as Adolf von Harnack says, that the indifferents form the strength of the Church,—those who live their lives according to the standard of their times and Churches and fulfil their duties in unshaken belief in God's grace and power without creating any characteristic types of religious life. But when we here turn our attention to the more strongly expressed forms of communion with God, we can distinguish in the mediaeval Church three or four main types: their characteristics actually appear

[1]This article had been entirely written and sent away for translation before the election of the writer to the See of Upsala.

sharply defined, but in certain combinations, even in the same person, and yet they are silhouetted against the background of the nameless multitude.

(a) If the majority of educated laymen had to choose, they would certainly sympathize, now as before, with the type which I rank first here, but which never influenced church life as deeply as the others because it implies education and not infrequently has borne an aristocratic or even a learned character in the Church. To this class of piety Christianity has meant true culture, being connected with all noble learning, art and letters. In the name of an enlightened faith it has scorned ignorance and superstition, which the Church has tolerated or sanctioned—hence the opposition common to these mediaeval tendencies towards the mendicant orders, especially the minorites; it has combated irrational doctrines and has denounced with genuine moral indignation worldliness and vice within the Church, particularly among her leaders. Its watchword was reform of life and doctrine. It was especially towards the end of the Middle Ages that it gathered ideals and motives for denunciations against the Church from Bible reading.

The purest and highest expression of this noble religious type and of its reforming tendencies is to be found in Erasmus, the man who forged some of the weapons which the Reformation used, and who at first sympathized with Luther, but later sheered away from the consuming zeal that he could not understand. He was repelled by the elementary vehemence of the movement. The Erasmian type of religion has existed, and still exists, in all religious societies which have attained to a higher standard of literary culture. The greatest of contemporary spirits congenial to Erasmus, Melanchthon, became Luther's brother-in-arms, yet not without some involuntary violence to himself. He was forced into a religious world which he could understand

and describe, enabled by his intelligence and his admiration for the religious genius he saw in his friend; but the heights and depths which it contained were never reached by the learned humanist of enlightened and harmonious piety. Of Erasmus's disciples, some became adherents of the new movement, some took up the defence of the Church according to the example set by Erasmus himself. From a certain point of view the nature of such piety can best be expressed by the word *reform*. For without being blind to the fact that religion is the work and gift of God, it conceives Christianity and describes it as an ideal of life, a new and perfect "law", according to which not only the Church in deterioration and backsliding but also each single heart is to be renewed. As of old, one turns still to ancient times. The Fathers and the Church of old were set forth as an example. Erasmus expressly sought for a canon, in the first instance from Scripture, but also from the Fathers. The first five or six centuries in their capacity as a relatively complete and finished epoch have been considered an authority for all times. Though *reformation* is an apt word for the work of Luther in his early years, it can scarcely be used to describe his creative continuation of Pauline theology and of the positive trend of mysticism. It is more significant as a name for those Roman tendencies which during the same century advanced claims for a return to a purer life and doctrine—never silent in the Middle Ages and now more firmly rooted than ever, owing to the decay of papacy. Cardinal Contarini took an important share in the bulls and commissions for reform issued by Paul III. At the Conference of Regensburg (1541) he seemed to be at his goal: the reunion of the Lutherans to the amelioration of Church and doctrine. The pontificate of Marcellus did not last a month; after that, Paul IV was the second in the papal line to show rigid morals and reforming tendencies. He began his reign in 1555 with the promise

of "faithfully seeing that the reform of the Universal Church and the Roman Court should be undertaken in earnest". It was he that boasted of never letting a day pass without a measure for restoring the Church to its primitive purity. Pius V, the most devout of the reforming Popes, enforced a severity in his own life and that of the Curia, in the fulfilment of episcopal and clerical duties as relentlessly as the Inquisition—revised during his reign—executed its bloody work of reformation.

In our Church we note, as an echo of this reformation movement, the efforts of the scholarly and artistic King John III. The reformation had dispelled a crowd of superstitions. But the King abhorred the profanity with which spiritual things were treated in worship. In the preface to the liturgy of 1575 we read:

"Ut antecessoribus nostris contra superstitiones pugnandum fuit, ita nobis cum saeviore prophanitatis Bestia belligerandum est . . . Magna pars pietatis in ceremoniis sita est."

In theological controversy John offers a warning against the disputes of the reformers and refers to the Fathers as rightly expounding Scripture and being opposed to the false doctrines of Rome.

Amongst the Roman Catholic modernists of our days similar notes have been struck. Now I am not speaking here of a school or tendency, but of a type of piety that appears in different societies, temperaments and combinations. We have used the great name of Erasmus for describing it. But is not England its native home before all others? It was there first in Western Christendom that enthusiasm for the faith of the Church, combined with classical education, burst into full bloom, to bear fruits in the Carolingian renaissance. It was in England that the first university of Northern Europe was founded. There, at a far later time, the learned Wiklif, in his reform of Church life and doctrine, invoked that evangelical law which scriptural research had revealed to him

(but at the same time he felt—what was unknown to Erasmus and his compeers—a need for anchoring his poor soul on a bottom deeper than the noblest of human aspirations, *viz.* eternal predestination). No idea can possibly enter one's mind of deducing from a single religious type so rich a growth as that exhibited by the Church of England. That Church, while maintaining her continuity, took a definite impress from the Reformation, in her Thirty-Nine Articles almost translating the *Confessio Augustana;* throughout the ages, down to our own time, she is richer than perhaps any other branch of the Church in genuine Platonic mysticism, and was fired in the last century by a sacramental view of the Church. But I am nowhere so keenly sensible of the beneficent value of dignified, enlightened piety, wide of heart and open to reforms, as in the Church of England. Nowhere has respect for the first centuries of the Church resounded with a more genuine conviction.

(b) Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola, the contemporaries of Erasmus in the sixteenth century, have influenced the life of the Church more deeply than he did, because they knew what Erasmus had never experienced—they knew heaven and hell. Both became emphatically men of religion, being led by different paths to entire devotion to the question of the soul's salvation. Both subjected themselves to unflinching asceticism which astute confessors could only alleviate temporarily. The wide dissimilarity between them appears in the final remedies which they found; Loyola got divine assurance in visions and sought refuge in his resolute will; Luther found support in the Word, in something objective, in the revelation of God in history. Both these religious heroes are rooted in the mysticism of the Middle Ages and are unintelligible if detached (as often happens in the case of Luther) from the various elements in the complicated texture of mediaeval religious life, but neither of them remained within the

sphere of mediaeval mysticism. They represent in a certain degree its two different currents: Loyola the Areopagitic, which lays stress upon the mystical experiences of the soul and the merging of the finite into the infinite, Luther the more positive trend in which religion provided the ethical antithesis of guilt and grace, rather than the metaphysical question of finite and infinite, and consequently accentuated the holiness and grace of God and the earthly calling. But each independently ushered in a new epoch. Loyola subjected the mystical training of the soul entirely to the Church. In Luther the positive tendencies of mysticism fostered a fervent belief in the divine revelation.

When consistently followed, the mystic ideal advances beyond time and space. In intuition and ecstasy the soul lives its true life without any direct connection with the ethical functions of history, be it never so strongly emphasized that the fruition of God is worthless unless it expands its zeal in self-conquest and works of charity. We can trace the mysticism of the infinite through the whole history of the Church, sometimes on the sublime heights of intuition, sometimes misled by error. It is not seldom accompanied by psychopathical extravagances, which are not for that reason to be condemned out of hand, but it is also influenced by impulses from the Gospel. The timeless mysticism is known to exist in all the higher forms of religion—it comes to life when by the influences of higher mental culture the religion of nature loses its self-assurance and flees in despair from all temporal to the unfathomable and infinite.

When this ideal of mysticism has attained a certain degree of independent life, its characteristic feature is a careful self-training in the methods of asceticism. By means of "exercise" (ἄσκησις) the soul wins its way from one state to another. In Western Christianity, as earlier in India, Persia and the Hellenistic world, a series of measures based on psychologic experience was skilfully

arranged to dispose the mind towards the mood required, to purify and prepare it for spiritual sensations which nevertheless were accounted by all sound mystics as gifts of divine grace, not as works of man.

After Loyola's life of chivalry had been checked by sickness, he became inflamed by a desire to live for God. But his unquenchable activity was set in relief by visions and spiritual experiences, gradually systematized into strict methods. The training of the soul has nowhere been conducted with more professional skill than in Loyola's *Exercitia spiritualia.* No educational genius has ever attained his goal with precision equal to his. The free growth of religious life is allowed no scope, but the soul progresses through mortifications, and other measures to favour self-suggestion, along the path of imagination to encounter death, to visit heaven and hell.

But Loyola's originality rests not only upon his talent for regulating the mystical self-training. There is far more importance in the goal he was aiming at in this training. All this cast-iron austerity of exercise, unconditionally and slavishly submitting to rules and superiors, became directed to an independent external object (in addition to that of obtaining personal salvation and communion with God): the power of the Church. Both personal will and personal conviction alike must be annihilated in order that the individual might be a supple instrument for the domination of the Church. By this severe subordination of visions and meditations and the whole apparatus of mysticism to the pretensions of the Church, a relatively new creation came into being. By this combination of methodical mysticism with enthusiasm for the Church as an institution, the "Spanish priests", or the religious type of the Jesuit, was separated almost as sharply as Luther from the Middle Ages.

(c) Though unable to bear comparison with the

wealth of the Churches of England and the Continent, the Swedish mediaeval Church has produced independent spiritual types corresponding to the two principal trends of mysticism. The longing for absorption in the Godhead transfigured Petrus de Dacia in the thirteenth century. Our most prominent quietist mystic, Sven Rosén, lived almost five hundred years later. As a representative of the other mediaeval trend of mystic piety—which was inclined to evangelical devotion rather than to extraordinary experiences and the airy liberty of mind in "*Abgeshiedenheit*" and "*Gelassenheit*"—we have to consider St. Brigitta, the greatest religious genius of mediaeval Sweden. In her case mysticism chiefly on the ethical side may best be studied. After the death of her husband, in 1344, her rare powers in visions and intellect, which had manifested themselves earlier, were utilized for a special divine vocation. For her as for other mystics the symbol of "bride" normally expressed her relation to the Lord. But the passages in her Revelations, where she dwells upon the bride's bliss are not numerous. But all the more is said of the honour bestowed on the bride by the duty to serve, and yet more remarkable is the absence of all methodical training. Docent K. B. Westman writes,

> "However high the appreciation of comfort to the spirit in contemplation, the thoughts of the bride are still far less concentrated on happy joy in the bridegroom's presence than on how to please him. The ethical dominates, and there is no hint of psychological methods for ascending to the contemplation of the Divine Essence or to a quietistic '*Gelassenheit*'. She called herself a poor runner, bearing the letter of a great Lord."

The Revelations served religious or historic purposes of a temporal nature, notably the Pope's return to Rome. She saw the works of God in the great historical events, as did the Prophets of the Bible, and she knew that their spirit lived in her. Fidelity in the divine calling displaced the doctrine of good works, and yet she attained no more than other mediaeval mystics to Luther's

frank reliance on God's free grace. On the other hand, her vocation inclined towards communities and the course of history in a manner alien to Luther's all-absorbing solicitude for the comfort and salvation of the individual soul and his slight interest in political life. Three Swedish names have a universal prestige in the religious world. Brigitta belongs to the array of biblical prophets, not to the representatives of the timeless mysticism of God-fruition. Gustaf Adolf was himself a man of history, not of the inner life. (The third, Swedenborg, was a visionary, imbued with acute knowledge of human nature and scientific thought.)

Luther belongs to mediaeval mysticism in the same way as St. Paul does to pharisaism. He is a spiritual son of the deep devotion of the Middle Ages, which nourished his soul with their fruits throughout life; when these did not so clearly as the writings of the Areopagite displace the soul from the solemnity and solace of the Gospel. The background of Luther's *De libertate Christiana* still consists of the Platonic-mystical dualism of soul and body, spirit and matter. In her spiritual existence the soul is free and happy, but she is constrained by the body to concern herself with mankind and the world. Thus she must in charity be the servant of all. But against this background are drawn the outlines of quite a different religious character, its chief features being blissful belief in the forgiveness of sins and fidelity to the earthly calling.

Luther became more true to mysticism than that Spanish knight in a monk's dress, inasmuch as Luther's goal was never planted in an institution but in the salvation of the soul and its eternal life, to be enjoyed in trustful fidelity to the divine service of the daily calling. Luther, as radically as any of the mystics, made heaven the sphere of the soul's existence. But he did it in the spirit of St. Paul and St. Augustine. However transcendentally Luther experienced and valued the soul's

joy in God, he never left behind him the ethical antithesis of the Gospel in his celestial excursions. Neither did it ever occur to Luther to use the methodical self-training of the soul. It is incompatible with a religious view, dominated by the antithesis of guilt and grace, and the overpowering nearness and might of God. The man whose heaven is to feel the embrace of the forgiving love of God cannot conceive of an endeavour to ascend from one state to another by tried ascetic measures. "Where the forgiveness of sin is, there are also life and salvation." Luther knew too well the infernal pangs of self-torture and of an anguished conscience to wish for a renewed visit in hell. And to heaven he was transported by God's grace in Christ, not by his own will power nor by any system of psychology.

It was this new trust in God—founded on Scripture and the work of God through Christ—and this spiritual freedom which, adopted by Olavus Petri, struck root in our country. Of the three Swedish names above-mentioned, whose renown is universal in the history of religion, two bear the stamp of the same type: St. Brigitta, who took up the work of the biblical prophets, and Gustaf Adolf, a hero in history and a man whose unfeigned trust in God dominated his whole life. To souls like these, as also to Luther and Olavus Petri, hell and heaven were not conceived as the tormenting sense of void and abandonment or as hours of ecstasy, but as something even more tremendous fundamentally: anguish of conscience and certainty of God's grace. To a religious hero such as Luther this drama of inner life expressed itself with an exceeding power that few religious people can adopt without incurring fancifulness or artificiality. But the real thing is the same in them as in him. The more positive trend of mediaeval mysticism appeared for the first time in Luther with unmistakable lucidity and imposing force showing its real nature and aim. In Luther this peculiar form of unworldliness and spiritu-

ality asserts itself in a new evidence; although it had existed in germ before, it was destined after Luther to develop its whole scope.

Turning to our reformer, Olavus Petri, we find much of the humanist in his championship of a softened administration of justice, and in the authorship of the immortal advice to judges, ever printed as a preface to the editions of the Swedish Law; still more, in his historical works. His unyielding love of truth was united to a critical mind far in advance of his day, in that it rendered justice even to the Roman Church. We recognize the mystic, too, but one of unalloyed inwardness, with no system nor apparatus, in his work on prayer in *A Useful Instruction* (1526):

"The prayerfulness of the heart can be unceasing; whatso man doeth, eat, or drink, sleep, or waken, or bend to his daily task; for such prayer is none other than a longing, sighing and groaning, wherein one striveth for somewhat that he seeketh from the Lord, in special wise to his soul's health; and such striving may always be held with God; let a man do whatso he may;—as one who is in prison, be he sleeping or waking, he longeth and striveth alway that he may be at liberty. . . . If so be prayer thus liveth in the heart, then is it prayer or ever it come to the lip."

But Olavus thoroughly learned from Luther the freedom of the Christian soul by grace of God's eternal mercy. That freedom is enacted by none other means than Christ worked once for all. Personal godliness excludes all legality from religion. No outward thing can bind the conscience.

"The word of God giveth us a Christlike liberty, so that we may freely use meats, drink, apparel, dwelling-places, times and other such outward things. . . . The monk has no advantage over other states of life."

To holy laziness Olavus deals no mercy. For the value of vocation depends on the faithfulness and diligence by which it is practised. All is "reckoned for service of God according as each man, in his office and calling worketh good unto his neighbour". None of the reformers has more strenuously upheld the dignity of

labour. None has more consistently excluded the self-satisfaction and insecurity of the doctrine of works. It was through Olavus that the Swedish Church imbibed the evangelical principles of Luther. Formal adherence to that Lutheran confession was not proclaimed before 1593. The Church Law of 1571 still declared:

"According as it is beneficial and indispensable for one to search into it, *i.e.* doctrine,—so is it easy to learn."

On this point Laurentius was content with a reference to the Gospels:

"Shall a man wish, in brief, to know what the Gospel is, and how to declare it rightly, then can he get no better teacher in word and example than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who according to the Gospel of St. Mark preached 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God', saying, 'Repent ye, and believe the Gospel.' Yet more certain it is that to preach the Gospel is 'none other than to declare the forgiveness of sins, and to declare repentance to all men alike.' "

If the Lutheran creeds were late in being adopted by us, Döllinger was none the less right when he pronounced that the Swedes were more Lutheran than the Germans themselves. The Gospel principle of the purely personal nature of godliness has been clouded in Sweden, as elsewhere, in manifold ways. But it constitutes the soul of the Swedish Church, which unceasingly strives to be realized, and to vivify the body, *i.e.* the church law and the life of its members.

In the experience and pronouncements of Luther no sect or schism had place. The thought of founding an order, society, or any other institution, or of abolishing or deserting the existing order, for the sake of crying abuses, so universally deplored, was from the start as alien to him as to the Master Himself. This has been shown by his clumsy imprudence and lack of plan, when he was thrust out of the Church against his will, and necessarily compelled to organize new divisions of Christendom. It is also shown in the reverent Catholicity of his description of the Church, which he gives in his ex-

planation of the Third Article of the Smaller Catechism at a time when opposition to Rome was most acute, and Luther was led by the events to apply the title of Anti-Christ to Popedom, in the vein of Joachim of Flores, Wiklif, and many other mediaeval enthusiasts. There is not a hint of needful separation, not a sign of exclusion. But he speaks of

> "The Spirit who calls me by the Gospel, enlightens me with His gifts, sanctifies me and sustains me in a right faith, even as He calls, gathers, enlightens, hallows, the whole of Christendom in earth, and holds it in the one true faith by Jesus Christ. In which Christianity He richly forgives me, and all the faithful for all our daily sins."

Here the view points neither to an institution nor a doctrine, but exclusively to God's doings in the past and now; to the Gospel by which the Spirit gathers the flock of Christ. Nor yet is the Gospel to be counted as an institution. In order to exclude all hint of comment or shallowness such expressions as "the Word", "the Scripture", are avoided, and we are compelled to think upon the contents of the good tidings, the grace of God in Christ. And yet the religious society is in no wise disregarded or unduly spiritualized; it belongs itself to the dispensation of salvation because the soul lives in it by God's grace. This is richly commented upon in the Greater Catechism, where Luther speaks with hearty warmth of the Church as the loving Mother of the Christian. But in this classical passage on the Church in the Smaller Catechism itself Luther avoids even the technical term, Church; instead of it he says *Christenheit*, in order not to narrow the view of his readers.

Luther was conscious that he merely held a firmer grip of Christianity. Grim hunger in the soul, the like of which he would spare even his bitterest foes, was the baptism of fire by which God chose him, as scarcely any other, except St. Paul in his day, to comfort the terrified and guilty conscience, and to rescue souls from their thraldom.

If we now survey the connection, we cannot fail to perceive how two fundamental thoughts of a more positive trend in mysticism culminated with Luther's experience. The yearning for inward communing with God won its fulfilment in the moral and personal property of divine grace answered by human devotion; and this imparted for the regulation of godliness nothing natural, legal, nor merely temporal or impersonal; but uplifted it entirely into the moral sphere of love and liberty, which alone availed in transforming everything institutional to a proclaiming of the divine tidings, and rendered the gift a real possession for the faithful. Not water, not bread, not law, not holy method, but faith alone is effective. The more positive schools of mysticism, with their increased concentration on life's own pressing duties, had aimed at a spiritual conquest of the world, daily won in the field, which Luther indicated as the fitting sphere for the service of God: the personal vocation faithfully exercised.

In spite of the zeal he devoted to beautifying even the meanest work, this form of God's service was, in Luther's mind, rather something permitted than a real part of the divine scheme of life, and the point of view was individual: the personal salvation of the soul. It was only later interpreted as a task: the work of all culture and history comes to be a commission appointed by God; and yet a perception of the mysterious power of evil, the goal which transcends the world, and the supernatural power of revealed religion, cannot fail to thwart an ideal of culture that is limited by earth. The perception of the call must be deepened and broadened. With Luther, as with others before him, this was tantamount to replacing, for clericalism and monasticism, sanctity in natural relations and business. But in an epoch of industrialism, vocation (in the moral and religious sense) must not at all be identified with a given occupation when the habit and aim certainly is to pro-

vide daily bread for the workman but may imply an innate scorn for joy in one's calling. Vocation is more. It is the organic unity of personal relations and duties which grows out of the individual's devout and praying submission to God's direction.

In like manner, the interpretation of God's truth must progressively deepen and advance: "When He the Spirit of truth shall come, He will guide you into all truth." We do not think this guidance is limited to the revelation and the rule to cover all times; to the reflection in the Apostle's faith of Christ's person and work; to biblical revelation; nor yet to the first five or six centuries. Luther was conscious that he had done no more than bring comfort and strength out of the inexhaustible spring of Scripture. Historical considerations verify this. But his work was no mere reproduction of an original. A kind of leavening in the Gospel trained a relatively new creature in him. We believe God's revelation continues. The key of the situation cannot be merely recovery, reproduction, reform; but the congregation abides in the declared guidance of the transfigured Lord, the Spirit. In "the reformation" the Spirit resumed His unfailing revelation, and thereby proclaimed and extolled Christ in Christendom (St. John 16: 14). Progressive consideration of that sort found impulses from Luther himself. There was a clearer consciousness among his contemporaries when they termed him not only "teacher" and "reformer", but "holy man of God" and "prophet", and spoke of his high office as apostolic and prophetic. Lutheran scholastics held a special tenet concerning Luther's call (*vocatio*), whose position was named *heroic*, standing as it did between the quite extraordinary commission of the Apostles and the customary calling of priests.

Our Church has expressed in words and shown with unmistakable clearness in its dealings that she means to enjoy the benefits of what God in Scripture and his-

tory has never ceased to utter to His people. The new conception of the Gospel animates with a new spirit the regulation and forms of worship which our Church has adopted. This we will now endeavour to interpret in brief.

(1) Not even the most sacred of all messages—the New Testament—is a law to our Church. Not even the laws of Apostolic times or the early Church are obligatory to her. It is proper, nay, necessary, that an established order exists and is maintained. Yet its nature depends on the expressed leading of the Spirit. We here encounter a difference equally with Rome and Luther's pupil, Calvin, who hold that a definite Church organization results from divine operation. *Confessio Augustana*, Act VII, runs thus:

"*Nec necesse est* [for the healthy unity of the Church] *ubique esse similes traditiones humanes seu ritus aut ceremonias ab hominibus institutas* (translated in the Thirty-fourth Article of religion, "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one", etc.).

(a) Not even the office of bishop, therefore, implies a divine command. And thus the Church's unity need not find an obstacle, as we consider, in a presbyterian constitution. The high value set on the episcopate by our Church is clear from a passage in the Church Law of 1571:

"Wherefore as this law was most useful, and without doubt proceeded from God the Holy Spirit, the Giver of all goodness, it was also universally accepted and approved over the whole of Christendom, and has ever since been and ever must be, so long as the world endureth; albeit abuses, which have been exceeding great herein, as in all other those beneficial and needful things, must be doffed."

Still no thought is here implied of a divine and unconditional law. The same Church Law rejects any fundamental distinction between the essence of a bishop's office and that of a priest. Our Church cannot upon principle admit separate gradations in that office which is needful for her function of extending the revelation of God to the soul of mankind. Organization displays its

suitability only according as this aim is promoted. No regulation is ideal. But our history proves, as we have seen, the immense advantage gained by the Church from episcopal control. Therefore we value it highly.

The same is the case with Apostolic Succession. It is a difficult thing to prove historically the existence of such a succession in the early Church. But it is unbroken in our Church, as far back as continuity is traced. All possibility has been removed for doubting the ritual continuity of episcopal consecration in Sweden. But it is certain that scarcely any Swedish Churchman has ever insisted on this as a necessity to salvation, nor to the quality of the society as a genuine Church. Any magical transference of authority or gifts would be sure to militate against the spiritual standards of religion. Yet we are not at all indifferent to the beauty of symbolizing the sacred connection in the faith of Christ among generations throughout all ages.

"We account our Church's special forms and traditions, not only with a pious regard which is due to an honourable heritage from our forebears, but as an endowment entrusted to us by the God of history" (Declaration of Swedish Churchmen in the Anglo-Swedish Conference, in Upsala, September, 1909).

St. Paul was in no way indifferent to his circumcision, his descent from Benjamin, and his training as a Pharisee, although he "counted all things but loss for the knowledge of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3: 8).

(b) Providence endowed Christendom in Sweden as elsewhere with a form of Church for the State, for the people, or for the realm. Why was it that types of piety, of which we have indicated the most weighty, could not find place in one and the same church society longer than the sixteenth century? We cannot here unravel the problem of the birth of the church communities of the Evangelical and of the Roman Catholic confessions, generated from one common church society of the Western lands. At the religious crisis one feature was at work which, it is true, though it existed long before,

progressed by reason of the Reformation and the treatment it received from the momentary supremacy of the Church. I mean the increased self-consciousness of the national Churches from the beginning of the fifteenth century. At the Synod of Constance (1414–1418) votes were given according to nationality. And the national (or, in plain terms, territorial) principle—*cujus regio ejus religio*—made itself felt in religion even in the Roman Church long after the Reformation with quite overbearing effect, *e.g.* in France. It was an obvious historic necessity for the Churches of the Reformation to weld this already powerful movement. And here Martin Luther's evangelical principle comes into view in all its religious idealism. Like our Lord and St. Paul, his anxiety in removing every feature of nomistic religion left open possibilities for different organizations. At this day many of the sixty-five to seventy million Lutherans, especially in the United States, live in free Churches, whereas the majority develop State Churches. Luther's disciple, Calvin, departed from the principle of freedom in constitution. In the reformed biblical view, as also in Roman Catholicism, the organization belongs to the divine institution of Christianity, although Roman Catholicism proceeds from hierarchy, and Calvinism from predestination of the individual. The system of the former is perfected—as nearly as may be—in the most imposing organization the world has witnessed; that of the latter, in unforgettable types and communities of self-conscious and competent humanity. History shows what organizing and bracing power the system of Calvin possessed; whereas that of Luther might become a shapeless mass in the hands of a sovereign power. Even in our day Lutheranism has shown a meek submission to the bidding of supremacy, at a time when the latter was in downright strife with the prevailing law; this submission was dictated not by weak concessions, but from the conviction that the Church

has no word and no responsibility in worldly concerns.

But the State Church was to Luther not a principle, but an historic necessity. Even in Sweden it was brought about with the co-operation of Gustaf Vasa's practical and patriotic policy. The reformers saw the rights of national policy, even in religious matters, and assigned the ancient *jus reformandi* to State supremacy, but not without imposing, for the benefit of souls, the duty of taking measures against the decay of the Church. Olavus said in his renowned coronation sermon of 1528:

> "True it is that the kingly office is rightly charged with the care of the earthly regimen, but yet moreover Christian love requireth that if the King will else be a right worthy Christian prince, it behoveth him to take heed that God's word be honestly proclaimed in the provinces and cities of his realm, the more so when they heed it not who are beholden to that duty."

This is the duty of government as a Christian government.

> "Now no harm else can be so great and terrible for subjects as the perdition of their souls. Wherefore, in so far as he wills to be a Christian King, the monarch must forfend such mischief, venturing life and limb therefor."

But spiritual authority in the Church is not the concern of supremacy. Bishops and priests are enjoined "to preach the word of God, ruling men thereby with spiritual governance".

A State Church came into being. In Olavus's deep esteem for supremacy as the bulwark of justice against crime and disorder, the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans emerges, sharply defined by a feeling that had grown up under the venerable sanction of ancient Swedish Law. But as Hjärne observes, Olavus did not resemble the German reformers in their modesty as subjects which he yet, like them, reckoned among Scriptural commandments. "There was too much mediaeval idealism in him." There was also in him, clearly enough, a more living interest in the concerns of the State and

the course of history than his great German religious teacher felt.

"In spite of all external drawbacks, his Swedish frankness made it impossible for him in the long run to become the dependent tool of worldly power."

The conflict between two statuesque figures in our history, at the dawn of the new day, has its tragic features, even though the physical hardship suffered by the unyielding preacher was at last relieved. The struggle was, it is true, in a certain measure, a contrast between idealism and realism; but there was in it no inherent clerical lust of power contrasted with the admitted requirements of the nation. Royal attacks on Church independence were, as we have seen, a transitory episode. Similar tendencies appeared in Johan's well-intended but impracticable efforts to restore primitive days; they culminated in imposing a Roman Catholic King on Sweden, in the person of his son Sigismund. It was only after this, at the Upsala Council of 1593, that mature Christianity in Sweden authoritatively declared itself to be Lutheran Protestantism.

The National Church then established presents, in contrast with other Lutheran Churches, a picture of originality, which escaped the notice of Troeltsch when he wrote his brilliant description of the history of Protestantism. Indeed, it destroys the tenet that Lutheranism is always the faith of the sovereign. The "Universal Free and Christian" council, convened at Upsala, on Feb. 25, 1593, adopted Lutheranism in the severest shape, although the Augsburg Confession and the Church Law of Lars Person Nericius were alone expressly mentioned, together with the three ancient creeds; and the other writings in the Book of Concord were only, after protracted efforts, adduced later as articles of faith in the Edict of 1663, and the Church Law of 1686. The synodal character of the assembly of the priesthood has been expounded by O. S. Holmdahl, deputy professor.

The Council of the realm co-operated in its governmental capacity. Members of the nobility took part. The decision of members of the other estates, too, was contributed later. Together with the Duke, "The council, bishops, knights and nobility, priesthood and merchants of the realm of Sweden . . . as well spiritual as temporal" (so they are termed in the records), sealed an alliance in the faith for themselves and their successors.

Who then was the lawful monarch of the land? The Roman Catholic, Sigismund, at the same time King of Poland. Who was its actual governor? His uncle, Duke Charles, the future man of the kingdom, who defended the views of Calvinizers with energy and deep learning. The principle *cujus regio ejus religio* was broken through. In this unique and unexpectedly critical situation, the national will championed with unbending austerity the Lutheran Church of the realm against the faith of the King, and the religious sympathies of the Duke; it thereby abolished imperial papistry for ever, and created (as we shall see) another historical peculiarity in our Lutheranism. I complained, several years ago, that this fact is not considered, nor even known or produced in publications accessible to international enquirers. Now, Dr. John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, who all too soon was called to his rest, has maintained it in his book on *The National Church of Sweden*,[2] and has dwelt at length on the significance of the Upsala Council:

"It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of this council as a turning-point in the history of Sweden. The law historians of the country have perhaps hardly realized its full significance and its unique character. It stands out as evidence of what a National Church may do for the people when it is allowed to have a reasonable independence. There are very few, if any, parallels to be found to it in the religious history of mankind. The freedom and the unanimity of the action could only be possible in a nation so much accustomed to the idea and practice of self-government by a large popular assembly, and so ready to be swayed by enthusiasm in making great decisions at critical moments of its history."

[2]London (1911), p. 261.

Just as her patron saint was canonized in the Middle Ages without papal aid, so Sweden confirmed her evangelical confession in later days, without the co-operation of the ruling monarch. Such was the rise and such the maturity of our National Church. She has experienced vicissitudes since then, partly a condition of the nation's destiny, partly the result of her intimate connection with evangelical bodies in general, particularly with the great tides of theology in Germany, partly a home-growth of religious movements.

How are we to estimate the idea of a State Church *per se?* Diverse suppositions may be entertained for different countries and Churches. Individual conditions may be interpreted without unwise generalization. Two fundamental principles, never quite reconcilable, inspire advanced religion in general, and Christianity in particular. One is the personal resolve of the individual. A choice is dictated between God and the world. Each person must form his decision. He can not be called a fully responsible Christian before he has experienced a conscious choice to belong to Christ. This personal decision is the root of the free church conception. A glimpse of something similar is at times caught from Luther's discourse on the congregation of the faithful. We see how the first assembly met at Jerusalem. We reflect upon all small circles since gathered for prayer and instruction, frequently under external pressure of persecution. The same eclectic individualistic wish to assemble none but the faithful in "scriptural" congregations (the title now preferred) animates persons inclined to set themselves more or less both formerly and now in opposition to the Church. This ill will arises from dissatisfaction at the multitude being indiscriminately embraced by the Church. Congregations of that kind have their function, live their life, and take refuge sooner or later in the fold, which, from a deeper point of view, they never forsook. How-

ever serious and inevitable personal choice may be, it is precarious to lay the foundation of a religious community upon human piety.

The other fundamental principle is the work of God, His grace past finding out. "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and on the unjust." For a righteous or a good man some would even die—but "Christ died for us while we were yet sinners" (Rom. 5:8). There is something inconceivable, even offensive, in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, and in such a daring preacher of Gospel comfort as Luther, who fearlessly opened wide the door to the grace of God. But the beginning and the ending in our Church is forgiveness of sins. She desires naught else than to win her way with this message to souls, for she is sure that nothing else can give them joy and moral strength, than to be embraced by God's unmerited mercy. If any form of the Church can symbolize this side of Christianity, it is the State Church. She defines no limits for her faith in Almighty God, and for her duty of caring for souls; but she is only bounded by the realm and its language. It is obvious that she does not mark off one nation and one national community from greater Christendom, but on the contrary conceives them as her home and the sphere of duty appointed to her within the Universal, *i.e.* Catholic Church of God. This conception follows the rule of limitation adopted by the Saviour. We belong to a province of Christ's Church but we will not count this province one whit less than the whole of our people—all who do not expressly renounce church life in common, and never entirely escape from her sight. Connection with the State brings its advantage and detriment alike. The main point is that in the very notion of the Church in the nation or kingdom we catch a human echo of the fundamental article of our faith—God's divine grace.

The Augsburg definition is of course derived neither from voluntary combination, nor from the nation, but it describes the Church as built upon the inspired Word. *Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta.* The Church's foundations are laid by the Word as identified with Scripture, sacrament, and proclamation. In essence the Word is Logos, Christ. He is God's Word to mankind, and the substance of the announcement. Professor Rudolf Sohm maintains that "The Word" in Luther's sense is not "the written Word completed in the early ages, but the living Word of God, nourished by the message of salvation, without being tied to literal Scripture."[3] It should be added that this same Word, on which the Church is founded, consists of an objective divine power. Such an acceptation includes all that God has done and said in the present and the past, for whosoever can see and hear.

(2) The evangelical principle also makes itself felt in the freedom with which forms of worship were taken over in perfecting the Reformation. We may marvel at the fact, for, previous to and after the Reformation, public worship displayed the two different types presented by historic religion. The gist of the earlier mass was a sacrifice, a communion with God enshrined in sacred ceremonial. In order that the Church might partake of God's grace it was needful to perform certain details, whether believers were present or no. Punctilious performance produced the essential. Through every page of religious history sacrifice is the acknowledged form for ritualistic communion with God in the proper sense. The other main feature in godly communion is the personal,—which of course can also be exhibited in connection with sacrificial rites, without being identical with them. In this connection early Christianity has

[3] *Weltliches und geistliches Recht*, 47 ff., separately printed from *Festgabe Karl Binding*, (1914).

built upon the previous worship of the synagogue, in creating a cult which was resumed and completed by the evangelical Churches, and which occupies a place of its own in the history of religion. Common worship consists of personal communion with God, practised by many at the same time.

The conservatism of our Church has preserved not only most of the mediaeval formularies but also the name "High Mass" to specialize the new kind of worship. It is the English Church that offers a contrast to sacrificial rites from the very title of its book, in which it terms public worship "common prayer". Our reformers were fully conscious of the distinction. Olavus Petri was consistent in excluding from the "Swedish Mass" of 1531 the offering of the mass, together with all that appertained to it, and he abolished masses in side chapels. In the same spirit his brother Laurentius, in the Church Manual of 1571 and elsewhere, cancelled that "abominate and noxious priestly sacrifice", but at the same time forbade not men "to call that sacrament a sacrifice, as hath always been the wont of Christendom, according to the sacrifice which our High Priest Christ once made on the tree, and which still is enacted in the mass".[4] The slight demands for ritual changes arose from that initial conception of church worship which did not contain a ritual sacrifice in the true sense. The wondrous work of art comprised by the Roman missal was pieced together with beautiful expressions of personal communion with God. Laurentius defended himself without ceremony in 1566 (in a work not published before 1587) against zealots who were fain to break down ritual, and radically alter public worship.

"The enemy cometh on again with large hate, and now assaileth us upon the other flank; they goad on certain who pride themselves on great spiritual wisdom to contemn us wholly and decry us for

[4]Compare further Olavus Petri's *Reply to an Unchristian Missive*, 1527, in his collected writings, II, 178.

open papists: in part, for that we cannot allow the views they hold of the sacrament: in part, too, in that we permit in our congregations certain ceremonies which have been wont and still are among papisticals."

(3) Dogmas and creeds, moreover, pertain to the set fashion of a Church. The Church Law of 1686 acknowledges throughout the *Liber concordiae* as the rightful declaration of Christian doctrine. The form of government of 1809 speaks only of the pure evangelical doctrine; the nature of this is assumed and declared in the unchanged Augsburg Confession, and in the decree of the Upsala Council of 1593. Therefore some doubt has arisen concerning the doctrinal validity which the Swedish Church allows to the other books contained in *Concordia Pia* (*Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, *Articles of Schmalkald*, Martin Luther's smaller and larger *Catechism*, and *Formula of Concord*). The question was brought into debate at the National Council of 1893. One party, which ultimately triumphed, championed the entire *Book of Concord;* the other endeavoured to limit the priest's obligation to the *Confessio Augustana.* Viewed broadly, the former standpoint was favoured by men of High Church leanings, principally to be found among the theologians of Lund, though not exclusively so, *e.g.* Bishop Keijser. The younger men of Upsala, who, from their principles, are warm defenders of the validity of the whole *Book of Concord*, were, on that 30th of September, only to be seen in the audience outside the synod among the most attentive listeners. Low Church theologians of Upsala combated the validity of the entire *Book of Concord.* They entrenched themselves in certain historic and formal pleas which have no interest for us here. On the other hand, it is very remarkable that, with some exceptions, such as Pastor Primarius Fehr, the distinction in the main coincided with a freer and more liberal acceptance of the *Confession.* This came out all the more transparently in the excellent debate. Short articles of faith were required

in order to adapt them much more easily—in the same way that it is easier to deal with a few legal paragraphs than to form a decision in the tenor of an involved and rich tradition of law. In this view, creeds possessed the character of law. But on the contrary, as Bishop Billing said, the High Churchmen would not "bind themselves to the letter of either small or large books"; rather, as Bishop Keijser expressed it, they would seek to penetrate "into the deep fundamentals of the *Confession*", maintain a position enlightened by history towards the books, and demonstrate that the Church is capable of "large points of view". This last consideration is far more difficult, for it demands a large degree of familiarity with classic productions which date from the period of constructive reformation. According to this view, the truth of a confession cannot consist of conjuring up certain passages, but in sounding the depth of the evangelical faith as it appears to be, and in feeling quite at home in it.

No doubt can be entertained that a standpoint, at once freer and more exacting, is supported by the very expositions of the *Confession* itself. The famous preface to the *Formula of Concord* evidences a more spiritual reflection of that sort. All books are to be subjected to Holy Scripture, and no otherwise understood

"than as witness to show how, and in what regions of the earth prophetic and apostolic doctrine, even since their days, is truly maintained."

"Reliqua . . . scripta . . . alia ratione non recipiantur, nisi testium loco, qui doceant quod etiam post apostolorum tempora et in quibus partibus orbis doctrina illa prophetorum et apostolorum sincerior conservata sit."

I would here like to use evidence no less pertinent and official than the debate of the National Council and its voting on September 30, 1893, in order to show that a leading conception in the spirit of prophecy and the Gospel has been clearly pursued in our Church concerning the

formulas of confession, as well as regarding organization and ritual.

It has often been observed and expressed that the Swedish Church has seldom conducted trials of heresy in the later centuries, and that the church authorities have mainly observed a broad-minded and calm superiority in dealing with peculiar, difficult, or disquieting views and methods in her priests. It is doubtless, though not invariably, the custom of the Swedish episcopate and cathedral chapters in matters of doctrine to adopt a patriarchal and protective patience, and to keep aloof from alarm and irritation: and this contrasts notably with other methods. Research and individual opinion have a freedom in the Swedish Church which are seldom seen in comparable communities. Our Church and its bishops and cathedral chapters have, for that reason, had to meet reproof and approval alike. We have, of course, as normal a supply of "heresy hunters" and execrators as of heretics, real or imagined. Not even the prohibition in 1726 of preaching "with all zeal against the mistakes of a brother in office" has been properly observed. But the fact cannot be denied. Whoever concerns himself with the matter must see that the confirmation of religious faith is best served by spiritual means. And a priestly endeavour to comprehend, guide and aid is better than a practice that adopts simpler or more formal means, or stands beholden to a bigoted zeal for pure doctrine. Nor yet is it always easy, however generally the difference is assumed, to discriminate occasional peculiarities of view from theoretical susceptibility and bold impulses to develop doctrine according to the light of experience gained. Pastoral love should combine with the conception that the Church has ever to learn, and that her preaching must be intelligible if she is to win souls. A no less astute observer than the present professor and *capitularis* at Lund, in Sweden, the renowned Danish historian of religion,

E. Lehmann, wrote as follows, while he was professor in Berlin, in an article inspired by the decease of Dean Pehr Eklund:

"Swedes find comprehensiveness and tradition all important; they yield to prevailing acceptations and accepted forms. Every one knows this, and it is seen in Swedish church life; but what is less observed is that under this bondage to formality a piety is at work, sealed with strong personal experience, not alone in the sects sheltered by the Swedish Church, but also in the church people themselves. And still less observable is the liberty at work beneath hard externals. The people are strict to observe church-going, Sabbath peace, scriptural austerity, contemplation and converse; but the Christian ideal moving among the thoughtful draws attention to other facts as food for reflection. Trust is reposed in the awe for sanctity which is presumed in the case of all who call themselves Christians and pass for godly persons; and respect for the higher grade of spiritual authority is apt to add to the conviction that anything may well have its Christian justification, so long as it is academically upheld. To my mind, Swedish church life herein reflects the English, and separates off sharply from the Churches of neighbouring countries which are dominated by the beliefs and misbeliefs of the laity."

With such a figure confronting him as Pehr Eklund, it is pardonable that a friendly neighbour should idealize the Swedish Church. But the fact that he does so is incontrovertible. The reasons just suggested have indeed somewhat to tell us. As early as 1571 the Church complains of a multitude of business that "entices the priest off from his book". The law of 1686 lays much emphasis on the study pursued by priests. At the visitation the rector shall "give the bishop to know whither his studies tend" (Chap. 27, Section 8). I do not know how seriously this instruction is now taken. One detail suggested to a candidate for the bishop's office, together with religious and moral qualifications, is "expertness and well-deserving at universities, high schools, and other offices of distinction". Theological training and high culture in general are, indeed, important to the episcopate, and they are found there. But it is still more essential for our problems that charges of heresy, and the concerns of doctrines, should be dealt with at first hand, in the

light of religious experience and history. The episcopate at least implies the possibility of personal relations between the priesthood and the administrators of the Church.

It is certain that in educated circles extensive interest may be excited for religious and philosophic aims, and their unfettered discussion. Possibly a part in this is played by a national characteristic,—a taste in certain districts for mental speculation, ambitious dreams, and the religious mobility of the nation's soul.

It is observed by Deputy Professor Westman that the Inquisition never found its way to Sweden during the Middle Ages: no great upheaval of heresy reached this country, and interest in doctrine remained slight. Thus when a new era dawned, no taste in persecuting heresy had ever been contracted. Nevertheless I ponder the fact that questions of doctrine are, as a rule, handled with no misguided pastoral care, and with a wide range of view: and that types of prosecutions for heresy, that elsewhere occupied men's thoughts, are declared unimaginable here; and that notably by men who hold anything but modern principles of toleration. It is clear that it is not tolerance of opposing views that brings about the liberty in spiritual movement which is commonly enjoyed by Swedish preachers. Enlightened tolerance does not explain this; but, on the contrary, like a weak and worthless neutrality in the world's struggle after truth, it should be despised by the very men who espouse a wide-hearted church government and who themselves never felt the theoretical difficulties of their priests, although treating them with consideration and affection. We feel inclined to refer back to Olavus Petri, and to call the phenomenon an heirloom from his fearless love of liberty. But afterwards there came the men of pure doctrine, jealous for unity in the faith, intolerant, and as pitiless as scholastics could be.

Exactly at this point, I take it, some light is thrown

on the unwillingness—which is now a tradition in our Church—to create martyrs. At one blow unity in religion has become a reality with us, in a manner scarcely discoverable in any other Protestant country. As we have seen, our Church donned the whole heavy panoply of Lutheranism; and in our next section we shall call to mind how the consciousness of being evangelical and Lutheran allied itself, under special circumstances, with national functions and grand political conceptions. Out of this wedlock between the weal of the realm and the strong unity of Protestant confession was eventually born a feeling of security concerning its faithfulness to that confession. This ought not to obey feverishly every casual opinion in industrious but unenlightened circles, nor yet to condemn lightly a righteous spiritual zeal in a crude state. That is as improper as shrinking from the upright endeavour to deepen the theory of the confession. Here we feel a sure confirmation of the faith. It is right to permit both independence and individuality. Concurrently with this consciousness of a tenacious tradition, the fundamental principle of the confession itself can not conceal its operation; this is at least the case among those whose studies have deepened their orthodoxy beyond the needful agreement to certain propositions, which is frequently quite superficial. The force of the confession does not lie in the quantity of its clauses, but in the essential richness which springs out of the living and eternal power in its principles. These conduce to religious experience and intimacy with church life. Unity in the confession must imply a perpetual demand for the work of the Spirit, and not a confederacy with spiritual indolence.

The men of pure doctrine never got a chance with us to exercise overwhelming power in theological strife. Times were all too busy for that. The contest between the types of Christianity concerned the Swedish throne. For Sigismund united in his person the Polish nation

of free noblemen, and the Swedish society, the keynote of which was expressed in Karl XI's motto, "One for all, and all for one": *i.e.* on one side, the henchmen of the Roman Catholic reaction conducted by the Jesuits, and, on the other, the supporters of the Council of Upsala. The depth of the contrast, and its significance to the general view of life and national powers, are set forth by Harald Hjärne. The tension became unendurable. The least serious point was that it cost Sigismund his Swedish crown. So it came to pass that, in the Vasa family, the grandsons of "God's marvellous man" were arrayed on opposite sides in the great conflict: against Sigismund, his uncle, Karl, succeeded by his greater son—*ille faciet*, "the man for the task". The cousins departed this life in the same year, 1632. Sigismund died in his Polish capital, before Gustaf Adolf fell in the hour of victory at Lützen. We must not pause to enquire into the motive of the German campaign and Gustaf Adolf's schemes. We will confine ourselves to one point, following the clear and undoubted evidence of accessible records. King and people were animated by an overmastering conviction that they were called by God to a duty which demanded the exertion of all their powers to the utmost. Providence visited our people at that time, and they did not shun the visitation. Among many men, and not the least those of the Church, the belief in Sweden's election possibly assumed the unchristian form that the Swedish nation stood nearer to God's heart, and superior to other peoples. As such a conception of God surely militates against the universality of the Gospel, so with equal certainty is it explicable on the human side, when we consider how Gustaf Adolf and his disciplined army were greeted by oppressed allies of the faith.

It is only a Christian trust in the divine vocation of states and communities that can sanctify the work of the community. Persevering faithfulness in accepted

duties, with due respect for those of other men, cannot be replaced by any clumsy general benevolence. Though we trace no connection nor cohesion, we trust it exists. But we can dimly discern our own path with God's help. If Christians are set in opposition to each other, we may mourn that God's ways are past finding out: but we can only give Him service when faithful to the bidding of conscience. There is no firmer seal set to the Christianity of the epoch of great power in Sweden than the conviction that the realm was called, as were the individuals, to the service of God's Kingdom. The Church conceived an essential part of its duty to lie in the maintenance of conviction, fresh and living; this was to be strengthened by the revealed Word; even fanciful collections of ancient records were to reinforce it, and all to prove the course of God's dispensation.

It was not only field preachers that applied the teaching of the prophets and the achievements of Old Testament heroes. In the most remote parishes went forth the sound of the same belief in election. Even today Michael Altenburg's *Gustaf Adolf's Feldlied*, "*Versage nicht du Hauflein klein*", is found in the classical hymnal of German and Scandinavian Christianity, and has also entered other languages.

> "*Tröste dich nur, das deine Sach*
> *ist Gottes: dem befehl die Rach*
> *und lass es ihn nur walten.*
> *Er wird durch seinen Gideon,*
> *den er wohl weiss, dir helfen schon,*
> *dich und sein Wort erhalten.*"

With regard to the King himself the facts are clear. None can read his letters without feeling that, before and above all else, his mind was set to lean on God's will, and to show forth His truth. Gustaf Adolf lived in God's trust and followed His divine call. No one knew him better than Axel Oxenstjerna, who exclaimed, during the proceedings recorded of the council in 1641, "He was a sovereign, God-fearing in all his works and

dealings until death!" The halo of character, work, and death encircling his head may possibly one day be seen by the whole of Christendom. According to E. G. Geijer, "As far as his fame extended, it was a ray of hope for the oppressed. A scheme for the liberation of Greece through Gustaf Adolf was espoused by Romanus Nicephori, a Greek, but it was transferred to Adler Salvius only after the death of the King." Cyrillus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote "with aged and quaking hand" a letter of remonstrance to Axel Oxenstjerna concerning the encroachment of the Greeks at the Holy Sepulchre. Pope Urban VIII, on hearing the tidings of the Swedish King's death, himself celebrated a requiem and mourned the loss to Christendom. In his alliance of the faith Gustaf Adolf rose above the limits of theological anathema and meditated a *corpus evangelicorum* of Reformed and Lutheran Christians. Even now, expressions of his and measures that he took bear witness to his eagerness that peace and justice should be given unquestioningly even to the worship of the Roman Catholics. He had acquired this discernment, not from theologians, but from his own healthy faith as a layman and his genius for instinctively realizing facts. Professor L. Stawenow, a student of his life, writes:

"When Protestantism won its position as a factor in the world's history, his soul begat from the hard womb of time the thought of spiritual liberty—a principle championed and protected by Protestantism too. This development was largely experienced by mankind in his day, and since. When at Augsburg Gustaf Adolf's own court chaplain denounced all compulsion in the faith, and he himself shielded Roman Catholic worship in the capital of Bavaria, the idea of religious freedom emerged out of the protracted gloom of centuries; the inner yearning of isolated spirits, long since forgotten, burst into the full light of the world's history. One of the greatest of earth's sons—for the moment the mightiest—proclaimed the thought to mankind; its power has never since been silent; its penetration has reached ever-widening circles."

But our King's piety must not be taken as an unique instance. It is by Calvinism that political heroism and

a national conscience have been created in Holland, France, Scotland, and America. Lutheranism has played the same rôle in Sweden. Only there has it focussed the people into an historic consciousness, and an activity influencing history. The consequence was a peculiar type of character-building, which is so readily observable in the statuesque solidity of its leaders, from the epoch of Gustaf Adolf and the Caroline period. It was from no failure in those champions of Swedish Lutheranism that we were unable to perfect their great faith as a creative, constitutional, and national factor. Historic consciousness with its high aims contributed towards the embodiment of a heroic type of piety; this can be clearly perceived and appreciated only when the leading men of that epoch in Sweden are confronted with contemporary Lutheranism of a different kind, and with the giants of the Reformed and Roman Catholic faiths.

Swedes of that day could not differentiate between the need of their own hearts and the weal of the kingdom. The sense of responsibility for public welfare endowed the godly with a robust earnestness which tended to gravity and checked egotistical religion. But the tone of this seriousness was also capable of heartfelt emotions. An instinct of mutual support was kindled by the worship of God in the same church, and the serving of Him in the same home-land. E. Liedgren, the hymnologist, points out how the Archbishop of Upsala, Haquin Spegel (died, 1714), in the morning psalm, "*Wake up my soul and early rise*", especially thanked God, Who

> "Did vouchsafe me to inflame
> With faith that maketh all men whole,
> And wholesome duty of each soul
> That bears the Christian Name.
> He taketh me,
> And maketh me
> In Church of grace
> To have my place,
> Him to adore,
> And hear the word
> Of joy that saveth evermore."

And when he betook himself to rest, his evening hymn was mindful of the kingdom:

"Our kingdom's weal
We, true and leal,
Now trust unto Thy care.
O, grant us peace,
And give us ease,
Our rulers' joy to share.
Thy grace, if lent,
And good intent,
To all who guide the nation,
No ill befalls
The realm that calls
On Thee with exultation."

A translation by the same writer shows how very Swedish this trait was. Johan Rists' evening hymn, "*Werde munter mein Gemäthe*" contains nothing about the country or government, but in Spegel's version of the poem a stanza is added with this prayer:

"Take our kingdom in thy keeping,
Lord; Thy holy Host advance
O'er our King; may they, unsleeping
Guard his house and governance."

There is no obligatory intercession for the government, but deeply-rooted sympathy for the people and its responsible helmsman.

The close wedlock between the Church's preaching and the purpose adopted by the will of the State was facilitated by national and religious unity. When the Council of Upsala espoused the authority of Scripture, and formally enacted the Augsburg Confession, in addition to the three articles of the early Church, Nicolaus Olai of Bothnia (a young professor), who was president, asked if the persons present were content to remain in that faith all the days of their life, and maintain their belief even unto death. The assembly rose and gave their approval with uplifted hands. It was then that he exclaimed, "Now is Sweden become one man, and all we have one Lord and one God!" That enthusiasm found an echo on the battlefield of Lützen, and it still lives

in the inspiring edict which prefaces the Church Law of 1686:

> "In our kingdom, and its subject countries, all shall confess themselves simply and solely Christians in the doctrine and faith, which is founded on God's Holy Word, the prophetic writings of the Old Covenant, and the apostolic teachings of the New, and is comprised in the three main creeds, Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian; and also in the unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530, established at the Council of Upsala in 1593, and set forth in the whole of the Book of Concord."

In this clause the law only repeated what was already a reality. The Roman and Reformed confessions were practically unknown in the kingdom. While the union with Poland still held good, dread of Jesuitical propaganda elicited legislation quite as barbarous in its shape as in its application, when it was sometimes practised. Insofar as the Swedish Church used other weapons than those of the Word for spiritual purposes, her infidelity to the evangelical principles of Luther was exactly parallel to that of other Churches. When Pietism extended over our boundaries, partly from possessions in Germany and partly from the Swedish prisoners of war in Siberia, the sufferings of the latter sought comfort in reading pietist books; but in faithfulness to the homeland's custom and Protestant principles, they worked industriously at agriculture and other profitable labour so far as their hands enabled them; they instituted schools, promoted law and order, established their own church organization at Moscow in a special consistorium. Then orthodox zeal obtained fresh purposes upon which to exercise its activity and ambition. Measures resulted in the edict against conventicles, issued in 1726 and better than its reputation, although in the previous centuries it has brought insufferable pressure upon the private assemblies for free mutual edification. There was a long delay before our Church began to school itself to what all Churches find so hard—not to quench the spirit, but to exercise it.

In the Swedish Church of the seventeenth century, however, actual religious unity implied more than a fulfilment of what mere orthodoxy required. The State derives an indubitable blessing from the absence of deep religious contrasts, provided that its unity does not engender clerical omnipotence. We have been spared internal religious warfare and wreckage of churches in the name of liberty or the name of the Ten Commandments. Prince Karl Gustaf expressed his unfeigned astonishment to Whitelocke, in 1654, in these words, "If there be not a uniformity among you in these matters, your peace will be endangered." Contemporary legal terms were used to indicate evangelical faith as the leading fundamental law of the realm. "Oneness in religion and rightful worship" was described in the phraseology of government as "the first and most lasting bulwark of a fair, uniform, and enduring governance". An examination of churchmen's utterances reveals that their highest point of view was surely not the welfare of the State; and yet they perceived that the position occupied by the kingdom in God's plan of the universe lay in religious unity. On that point, too, all estates were convinced. The protection of the true faith was the foremost aim of the State.

Religion holds higher points of view than mere placidity. If mankind or its form of religion becomes *beatus possidens* in its realm, human self-satisfaction finds an easy decline from the fear of God. Acute contrasts in faith in the same country may well bring about strong effort and a quickening of spirituality. The light of heaven can shed an unusual radiance when falling on wonderful facets in a composite religious history. But the Spirit takes exceeding care to maintain a sacred longing for better things, even without contrasts in the profession of faith. Where shall we find more sorrowful yearning of the soul than in the written and unwritten records of our devotional life? Our own days find in-

centive enough in the power exerted by emancipated belief upon civilization, and in social problems. It is not only in days gone by but also for duties of the present and of the future that Providence has graciously favoured the mighty development of various confessions and types of evangelical piety. It has also created a defence to protect them. Alertness and security of this sort should also impart to judgment of other forms of Christianity a calmer and more comprehensive view than when fiery civil strife generates suffering, and creates a need for zealous defence, without space to withdraw and obtain a clear perspective concerning the most effective means for a well matched and loyal rivalry.

Since the final defeat of what was a mighty conception, but not devoid of danger for purity of religion—I mean the proud thought of organizing a single Church to sway the world—universal Christianity is being realized by means of various communions which conceive themselves as friendly rivals and fellow-workers with mutual understanding. Sympathy for the whole body of Christians gains strength in the same measure as the appointed duties of a single communion are performed without timidity. If a new "*corpus evangelicorum*" comes into being, not as a political creation but in a truly Catholic temper, without sectarian self-sufficiency, this cannot be by means of admixture, nor from any disregard for the reality of characteristic discrepancies. The one requisite for a working Catholicity is a keen perception of the genuine gift of grace in each Church. Faithfulness to one's own heritage is combined with consideration for the ideals of others. If our Church retains her own individuality in welding her unbroken tradition of constitution and worship with an increasing development of the evangelical spirit, she will not fail to perform a share of her function. Our history sufficiently proves the communion we hold with evangelical allies, not only of the Lutheran faith but also of the

Anglican Church. Added to this, more especially in recent years, we discover impulses from reformed movements which have quickened her spiritual vitality without thereby breaking church unity. If on our Church is laid a charge to link up Christianity to some extent, it can only be realized by grace of God in so far as she fulfils her proper vocation of enlightening with revealed truth the souls in our land and its mission fields.

Congregationalism and Its Ideal

By Meredith Davies, M.A., B.D.,
Melbourne, Australia.

Cardinal Newman said that ideas are the life of institutions. It is so true of the Congregational Church (and indeed of Nonconformity in general) that it may be more fitly described as an idea and a spirit rather than an institution and an organization. The earliest form of an institution is an adaptation of a spirit and ideal to the environment into which they are born. So that new conditions and ages and countries to which that spirit and ideal are applied demand corresponding new adaptations, and a conservative reluctance to make any institutional change may be the mark of an undiscerning loyalty and a check upon the free creative spirit to which the institution owes its birth. In so far as I glance here at the genesis and growth of the Independent movement, it will be in order to silhouette its genius. For a clear recognition of that which is the genius and the *raison d'être* of the Congregational Church should facilitate the progress of the movement towards the reunion of Protestant Christendom.

Modern Independency is a blend of three strains—the subjectivism of the Anabaptist line, the positivism of the Calvinistic line and the institutionalism of the Commonwealth period in England. The strain which has been most in evidence in recent years is the super-traditional prophetic spirit so characteristic of the Anabaptists. The strain most in need of re-inforcement, according to Dr. Forsyth, is its positive evangelical theology, while the

element which is being subjected to increasing discussion is its democratic and granular polity which is undergoing a gradual change. It is the question of polity, in the sense of constitutive Church principles, which chiefly concerns us here, partly because the revival of mystic prophetism is only our local expression of Modernism, while the positive evangelical stress is a part of the general movement to keep modern faith on the lines of historic fact. In both these respects, we are sharing currents of thought and life which are common to all the Churches. But our polity is our own, and its inadequacy, even for our own distinctive ideals, is widely and deeply felt. It is fortunate that this sense of institutional inadequacy synchronizes with a still more general desire for a closer fellowship with other communions.

During the rise of English Independency in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the question that is chiefly to the fore is the higher constitution of the Church as distinct from its administrative regulations. Without dealing in detail with the views of the various leaders, we may summarize their main contentions as being:

(a) That the Lord Jesus Christ is alone the Head of the Church and that the administrative finality of the State in Church affairs was a practical violation of that.
(b) That the governance of Christ in the life of the Church was a perfectly practicable ideal and alone ensured validity to its procedure.
(c) That membership of the Church was a personal and not a parochial matter, and that therefore there could be no integration into the Body of Christ except through individual confession of faith.

Those were the primary and creative principles, though they were soon followed with corollaries affirming local independence and democratic franchise (based on Christocratic control) and eventually separation of

Church and State. And the tragic vein in Independent history is that these corollaries have obscured and largely displaced the cardinal and creative principles. Hence the familiar misconception that Congregationalism is "democracy applied to Church affairs", against which Dr. Dale so frequently protested. Hence also the mistranslation of spiritual autonomy into an exaggerated separatism, involving not only severance from the State but isolation from Churches of its own order. These extravagancies must be read not only as declensions from the classic ideal, but as proof that the Nonconformist spirit had not found fitting and final institutional form. Indeed there is continual evidence of elasticity and variation with regard to the administrative constitution of the Independent Church. The Barrowists, *e.g.* assigned to deacons and elders a degree of authority far in excess of what Robert Browne and his followers conceded, though even Browne's system had a Presbyterian element.[1]

Further, at least two representative proposals for union with the Presbyterians were made in the seventeenth century and the nature of the proposals shows that the Independents were by no means irrevocably wedded to their form of organization.[2]

Again, the Commonwealth Independents, though they repudiated uniform State control, accepted the principle of a positive relationship of Church and State. That has just been revived in England by so distinctive a Congregationalist as Dr. P. T. Forsyth, who accepts the inner principle of establishment, though not its empirical form.[3]

Further, the idea of self-contained Churches, completely and separately independent, was felt then and is felt today to be uncatholic and defective. As a result, the most marked world-feature of recent Congregational history

[1] Clark's *History of Nonconformity*, Vol I., pp. 197–198. Also Selbie's *Nonconformity*, p. 46.

[2] *Vide* the Independent "Petition for the Propagation of the Gospel" 1652. Also the "Heads of Agreement" 1690.

[3] *Faith, Freedom and the Future*, p. 328.

has been a centralizing tendency. The federal ideal is rapidly gaining in favour both as between Congregational Churches and as between Congregationalism and other bodies. So it is clear that much indefiniteness and defectiveness have all along prevailed with regard to Independent polity. And the final reason for that is that the Christocratic principle, which is the basis of Congregationalism, has not yet found appropriate institutional expression. Nonconformity's ideal was high—a polity and institution which were the Spirit's express creation through Christ-dependent men. But the ideal miscarried in process of articulation, and Independency, instead of following its creative impulse, turned aside from its own cardinal principle and became imitative of what it believed to be the New Testament model of a Church. The result is, as our most recent historian affirms, that the world has still to wait for an adequate constructive expression of the Nonconformist spirit.[4] That conclusion is significant, particularly as it emerges as the dominant lesson of a detailed study of our history. And yet it is not an astonishing conclusion, for the historical complications in which the ideal was enmeshed were bound to affect its expression. And they certainly obscured the vision of those who should have been the guardians of that ideal. But the true significance of that conclusion is this: It requires that a new constructive effort be made to articulate the Congregational ideal. And since the environment has changed, and the world-issues are so vitally and vastly different, it is natural to infer that its institutional form will be correspondingly different. The construction required must be, of course, the result of collective spiritual effort, though it is necessary to such an effort that we define again the creative principle of Independency in its significance for us today.

Such an effort, of course, implies the abandonment of faith in the primitive model as being the sole and final

[4] Clark's *History of Nonconformity*, Vol. I, p. 203.

ecclesiastical design. A strong case may be argued that it is the Congregational Church that reproduces most faithfully the prototype of the apostolic period. But a still stronger case may be established that no divine finality attaches to New Testament polity, for polity reflects environment and is justified by its works, and none has sole authority and validity. This is a case where conformity to the primitive model (even if we were absolutely sure of the model) would be pedantic and unhistoric, for today's world is not that of Paul's Epistles.

On the other hand, this ideal does not necessarily imply that Christ's creative presence can only result in one uniform organization. That would be to repeat the greatest blunder of English ecclesiastical history, as well as to forget the temperamental diversity of those who constitute the Body of Christ. For even the Divine Will is conditioned in its expression by the personalities through which it works, so that rigid uniformity would not be a natural result. Indeed Dr. Garvie finds in this the *differentia* of Nonconformity.[5] That there ought to be outward uniformity corresponding to inner unity is the note of the conformist movement. That there may be variety and variation corresponding to the infinity of the Divine Spirit and the diversity of human personality is the nonconformist attitude. One may subscribe heartily to the latter view in so far as it is a protest against a wooden uniformity, and yet hold that its demands can be adequately met within a single truly catholic Church. The inner principle of Nonconformity does not demand as its embodiment the present disunion and anarchy.

What then is the cardinal principle for which Independency stands? For we are truly a Church of one article which should forge and fashion our entire institution. Its ideal is that the Church should be the organized expression of the creative will of Christ, as revealed to

[5] Constructive Quarterly, September, 1914, pp. 481–482.

believers in devotional and deliberative fellowship. The aim of a Congregational Church, in ultimate definition, is to give effect, throughout the entire field of its activities, to that supreme and sovereign principle. So that, "when the Church reaches its ideal perfection, the acts of the Church are the acts of Christ, and what it binds on earth is bound in heaven, and what it looses on earth is loosed in heaven". Those are the words of Dr. Dale, and it is significant that in his application of that principle he lays stress, not upon the right of every man to share in the government of the Church, but upon the responsibility of each to secure in the discipline, doctrine, and worship of the Church the supremacy of its Divine Founder and Lord.[6] So long as we effectively ensure the living Headship of Christ and the responsibility of believers to discover the living will of Christ, polity may be safely regarded as subsidiary and revisable. And that principle is capable of effective realization not only in Congregational polity (which in some points contradicts it) but in the polities of other Churches, and it certainly need not be infringed in the polity of a united Nonconformist Church.

Now comes the final question as to the significance of that principle for the government, worship, and service of the Church.

We must hold certainly to the sovereignty of the people under Christ in our Church organization. We cannot go back upon that, either in Church or State. But we need not hold it in a sense which endangers the larger interests of the Church of God. We certainly need not hold it in a sense that is antagonistic to representative government, for democracy is not annulled but rather more effectively expressed, through representative government. The State is not a negation of the popular will, but a crystallization of it (in democratic countries). So a united Church, which would be the analogue of a demo-

[6] *Manual of Congregational Principles*, p. 62.

cratic State, would not violate, but enact the will of its constituent members. Democracy, both in Church and State, is not only compatible with, but is dependent on, delegated control and central authority. It is on this point that Dr. Dale is today in need of revision. So long as graded orders, from Deacons to Bishops or General Assemblies, are directly or indirectly the chosen representatives of the commonalty of the Church, which commonalty in its turn is representative of the will of Christ, there is nothing in the system subversive of the real Congregational principle, for the interests of the Kingdom of God, especially in the world-environment of today, demand an organization no less powerful and no less effective than that of a modern State, however different will be its methods. And we are, by our first and fundamental principle, committed to that form of organization which will give most adequate effect to the sovereign will of Christ. But our present organization, admirable as it is for individualist purposes, is ill-adapted to aid "the impact of the whole of Christianity on the race". Its international figures illustrate very clearly its difficulty in self-propagation. And we have reason to heed Harnack's remark, "how certain a Church is to perish when each congregation is independent. . . . History teaches that large communities can last only if they are bound together in an organic body".[7]

So the true reading of the central Congregational principle is not democratic privilege, but equal responsibility to give effect to the Will of Christ. It is desirable to retain in the hands of members such privileges as the election of officers and the calling of a minister. But it cannot be said that the referendum type of democracy, as distinguished from the representative model, is necessary to the Congregational ideal. Moreover, that notion is more honoured in theory than in fact. For the general tendency in Independent Churches is in the oligarchic

[7] Address at Berlin on April 28th, 1914.

direction, Church Meetings being largely confirmatory of the decisions of Deacons' Boards.

In respect to preaching and worship, the Congregational ideal tends to extreme high-churchism. It lays a maximum of stress on the supreme sacraments with a minimum of stress on the mediating ritual. Its preaching is ideally a true elevation of the host, and the personality of the preacher becomes the chalice of blessing. It is an ideal which demands of its preachers not merely a proclamation of the Gospel message, but a sacramental communication of the Living Christ. In spite of an excessive disdain of the symbols of priesthood, it exalts the preacher to a height of responsibility to which no priest was ever elevated. For whereas the personality of the priest is an impertinent matter, if he is duly authorized and ordained, the personality of the preacher is pertinent in the highest degree for the conveyance of heavenly blessing. The condition of his being a medium of grace is a consecrated personality and not official ordination, so that our theory of the ministry is priesthood *in excelsis*.

Consequently, all worship is an act of "partaking". Every service is essentially of the nature of Holy Communion and no institution can exceed in solemn meaning the ordinary diet of worship. Therefore the Lord's Supper inevitably loses its uniqueness, while the other sacraments fall into very uncertain significance. Here Independency has approximated to Quakerism, though more in theory than in practice. This again is a principle upon which it cannot go back. But it has much to gain from a fuller recognition of the suggestive significance of the insignia of sacraments. It loses not a little spiritual influence through its neglect of appropriate ritual. It tends too much in the direction of the public meeting. Congregationalism, which is natively high-church, would increase in impressiveness if in this matter it reverted to Catholic tradition.

Finally, and most relevantly, the ideal has fruitful

application in the direction of service for the Kingdom of God. Here, much more than in Church government, comes the responsibility and opportunity of the member. The modern study circle is an admirable illustration of the Congregational principle at work. It proceeds to a discovery of Christ's Will through study coupled with prayer, and the whole is a preparation for service. There our constitutive idea finds expression in relation to the service of the Kingdom of God, and so long as we ensure that expression of it, we save alive the soul of Congregationalism.

It is clear that the basal principle of the Independent Church is of the greatest significance and value. Everything proceeds from the creative presence of Christ in the fellowship of believers. Applied to the pulpit, it throws into relief the sacramental significance of preaching. In respect to the act of worship, it implies a revised doctrine of the Real Presence. In relation to service, it constitutes believers the veritable Body of Christ—hands with which He builds His Kingdom, feet with which He carries the Gospel to all the nations of the earth, while its application to the Church and Churches demands, not perhaps unvarying uniformity, certainly not the present disunion and strife, but such a relationship as is expressed in the words "that they may be one, even as we are one". It is a profound and majestic ideal. We find it inadequately expressed in Congregationalism as it is, and we are driven to the conclusion that for the effective expression of our own cardinal principle, considerable changes are necessary, involving less conservatism with regard to the polity that exists, and a clearer recognition of the fact that a more collectivist polity and organization are indispensable to the achievement of our one great end—the Kingdom of God upon earth.

Christianity in Germany During the War

By Adolf Deissmann,
Professor in the University of Berlin.

[Professor Adolf Deissmann, of the University of Berlin, whose repute as a biblical scholar is international, has been sending to former pupils and other friends in America letters on the changes in the religious life and spirit of Germany, brought about by the war. These letters have aroused much interest, as they have passed from hand to hand, and the wish has been often expressed that to many parts of them, at least, a wider publicity might be given. Written from week to week, suggested by passing acts or scenes in the great world tragedy, they are singularly interpretative of the German people in some hitherto unsuspected phases. Dr. Deissmann has urged all who will and can "to come over to us and study in our own country and among our own people a phenomenon which, historically considered, will once belong to the great religious movements in the history of the world". His letters are themselves a sufficient evidence of its interest and import. Twenty-two are before me. I have selected from thirteen of them passages aggregating about a quarter of the whole. All omissions are indicated. A few errors in typewriting have been amended. Otherwise the passages are printed precisely as they were written. The English is Dr. Deissmann's own.

Benjamin W. Wells.]

Dec. 6, 1914.

. . . The first Sunday in Advent brought with its prospect of a "War Christmas" the review of the great religious revival, which the war caused in Germany's Protestant Churches. In future letters I expect to make some further remarks on this magnificent spiritual awakening. Today, I shall mention but one of the marked appearances that accompany this great revival.

As the war has liberated all the physical and psychical forces of the German people, so not less the "power of

song" plays its part in this competition of energies, and we may rightly speak here of a mobilization of sacred music. Never in the history of our people have the hymns "*Ein feste Burg*" or "*Nun danket Alle Gott*" and the old Dutch "*Dankgebet*" had such a rhythm and ring as during these months, at home as well as out on the battle field; the voices of German warriors, both Catholic and Protestant, have never been united in such a pious and fraternal way before, and the effect of these gigantic choirs singing the Ambrosian Hymn is simply grand.

One example of our sacred music seems typical. In the old Cathedral of Laon in the North of France, a large congregation of soldiers assembled on the first Sunday in Advent, Nov. 29th, 1914, having been invited to a "Musical Devotion" by the "German volunteer ambulance man" Fritz Stein, and "Sister Marga". The congregation, among which there were many wounded soldiers, began their devotional exercise with the "*Altniederländische Dankgebet*". Fritz Stein played the *Fuge in Es-dur* by Bach and the Pilgrims' choir from "*Tannhäuser*" on an organ which had 3 manuals and 54 registers, and Sister Marga sang the "*Ave verum corpus*" by Mozart and "*Wenn ich einmal soll scheiden*" by Bach. The meeting was closed by the congregation in singing "*Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme*".

That one of the volunteer ambulance men should give a recitation of Bach, and one of the sisters a Mozart recital, is not a rare occurrence in this war. We have quite a number of men in our army, who would well be able to conduct "*Parsifal*". . . . And I am convinced that the old halls of the French Cathedral now grey with age, will have caught the strain of the same Christian piety in Bach's Fuge as well as in Mozart's "*Ave verum corpus*", which once helped to build up those columns, stones and capitals as it were to a Hallelujah in stones.

Dec. 20, 1914.

. . . How often I had to think of Prof. James during these days! Of what great interest it would have been to him to look into the large, comprehensive and valuable material that has come to light during the past months in thousands of human documents, referring to individual and personal religion as well as to its social aspect.

. . . The religious awakening through which we are passing now is by no means limited to Germany alone. Certain psychological phenomena in the present life of France that have come to my notice, especially through letters found on the battlefields where no ownership could be ascertained, have led me for some time to the conviction that the classical land of religious decay and indifference is just now, in consequence of the war, experiencing a religious revival. The heavenly lights, almost extinguished, in leading social and political circles at least, brighten up once more. The Swedish writer, Theodor Holmberg in Stockholm, an eager student of war in its influence upon religion, comes to the same conclusion with regard to the situation in France. His testimony deserves our attention all the more, as it comes from a neutral state. The neutral states, too, show unmistakable signs of a religious awakening. Swiss chaplains in the army relate with deep emotion of their observations among the Swiss soldiers: how forcibly the soul feels the crying need of a God and the reality of a life beyond. The preaching of the old Gospel all at once has become popular and a great and precious opportunity is afforded to the minister.

Shall I now speak of our own religious awakening here in Germany, which Theodor Holmberg likewise mentions, I must first admit that many of us have lost much along religious lines through this war. Through the same countless bonds of Christian brotherhood, especially with Great Britain, have been rent asunder, be-

cause it came upon us in a time of the most earnest endeavor, on our part, to gain the friendship of England—an endeavor, prompted just as much by political considerations as by the feeling of christian responsibility. I do not speak of a matter in which I am uninformed, for during the past six years with full confidence did I co-operate in the attempt to bring about a better understanding between Germany and England. I most deeply deplore the rupture of these christian relations, and as yet I have not been able to see a way by which, through human endeavor alone, a christian fellowship could be restored.

On the other hand I am thankful to admit that the war has at least given us a sort of substitute for this loss, viz.: the christian sense of brotherhood among ourselves. This has developed more and more, not only between the various bodies of the evangelical churches of Germany but also between the Protestants and Catholics as well.

This, of course, does not mean that all the old leaven has been swept away at one stroke. We wish to remain sober in giving a fair opinion upon so great a fact. A nation of 65 millions cannot be changed all at once, as by magic, even by so tremendous an experience as this war of 1914, and after peace has been restored, there will still be plenty of obligation to be met in the line of religious-ethical development.

But, taken as a whole, our nation has been stirred up as perhaps never before. The number of those who, as individuals, have been harmed religiously through the war cannot seriously be compared with the many who have received a spiritual uplift through the same. For never before had individual piety so much revealed its social aspect in the army as well as at home. We are now one big religious commonwealth, whether in the village church, where the peasant folk mass themselves together for prayer in behalf of the soldiers, or in the

field, where the young volunteer, a former student of theology, preaches to his comrades under the open skies before giving the oath of allegiance to their flag, or even yet in the *Dom*, where the minister to the Court, Dr. Dryander, brings his message of the Gospel of Power and Confidence to the thousands of his audience.

The gospel of Power and Confidence: In our long period of peace here and there [this may have] become weak and sentimental, but now through the war the old and heroic forces of christian faith have once more broken through the outward forms of conventional piety and become part of the conscious life of the church and the individual believer. The great facts that our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is not only the Prince of Peace but also the Mighty of God, who faithfully sacrifices himself in behalf of the brethren and victoriously conquers death: these certainties of our faith are now sources of strength for the fighting nation. The war has not only awakened religious life but strengthened it, it has made stalwart men and done away with all sanctimoniousness and self-complacency, and thus the present time reminds the historian of those heroic ages when our and your forefathers expressed their faith in God without conventionality, but in the freshness of true inward life firmly planted their feet upon the rock of ages.

Dec. 24, 1914.

. . . Of one single branch of the organization for our Christmas celebration this year I should like to tell you something, viz.: the preparation of literary gifts for our fighting armies. All that has been published since the beginning of the war, together with special literature for the soldiers, forms a special characteristic chapter in the history of this war, and the approaching Christmas time in particular has set in motion many a pen.

I begin with a small affair of a more private nature which has given me much pleasure. All the members of

the Berlin Theological Faculty, 24 in number, united to send Christmas greetings to the Theological students of Berlin out in the field. Before the outbreak of the war we had 511 men enrolled in our department, and from these, not including those already fallen, 60 per cent are on the firing line, most of these as student-volunteers. To all of them, so far as they could be reached in their various places in East and West, we sent greetings through a field-letter. Each professor wrote a short, strong sentence, taken either from the Bible or from Augustin, the old Saxon Heliand, Luther, Ernst Moritz Arndt, Schleiermacher and others, and the facsimiles, bound together in a little booklet, were mailed to our fighting comrades in Belgium, France and Poland. In this booklet you will find the handwriting of the venerable senior of Berlin University, Dr. Bernhard Weiss, now 87 years of age, also Dr. Count Baudissin, Dr. Adolf von Harnack, besides men like Dr. Kaftan, Dr. Seeberg, Dr. Strack and all the rest of us, till down to the youngest of our instructors.

But the students themselves, who are still at home, have not forgotten their fellows in the thick of the battle. Numerous fraternities among the students have caused the publication of Christmas books for the members in the front. The most marvellous organization however, is that inaugurated by the D. C. S. V. (*Deutsche Christliche Studenten-Vereinigung*). This is known in America as the Student Volunteer Band of the Student Volunteer Movement organized by Dr. John R. Mott. This body of christian students has mailed to every German student who participates in this great war, either as soldier or member of the Red Cross a book. "*Deutsche Weihnacht*" (A German Christmas) is the title given to their literary gift, and they have succeeded in winning as contributors men of all faculties, various professionalists, political and military leaders, artists and poets. . . . If one considers that up to last week more

than 20,000 copies of the book had been sent out into the various Army Corps (only to University students) one may imagine the wave of brotherly love that flows back and forth, prompting the hearts at home and stirring the emotions of our university men in the ranks of the armies.

When you come to the festive gift in literary form, given to every soldier without distinction, you have before you the picture of a huge avalanche, rolling down the valley. . . . In those first months a booklet of Geheimrat Dr. Conrad, pastor of the Kaiser Wilhelm Gedächtnis Kirche in Berlin, entitled "*Ein feste Burg*" reached its 950,000th number. In the beginning of December another pamphlet by the same pulpit-orator, "*Weihnachtsgruss*" (Christmas greeting) had reached its 400,000th. The pamphlets of the "*Evangelischer Trost-Bund*" (Evangelical Association for Comfort) have been sold up to 1,440,000 copies. . . . That the Catholics have not been idle either is hardly necessary to mention. Thus you can vividly picture to yourself the power of God's word in the German army of 1914, and especially how wonderfully Christmas time helps to call forth a host of spiritual energies in millions of human souls. "The word is running" (2 Thess. 3:1).

Dec. 31, 1914.

. . . In the December number [of THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY] I was especially interested in the essay of Eugène Tavernier and, I gladly admit, I was even deeply moved by it. Here in Germany,—it may sound paradox, but is nevertheless true—we have just during this terrific war an especially keen ear for all that vibrates within the inner soul of our neighboring nation, toward which almost without exception no bitterness is felt even today. All that Tavernier says about the heroic participation of the French clergy in the war concerns facts which are not unknown to us. In his pastoral

letter, dated from Nov. 10th 1914, my highly esteemed friend, the recently appointed archbishop of Upsala, Dr. Nathan Söderblom, had already in a similar way, by describing the religious situation created through the war, depicted the share the French clergy take in this conflict.

Likewise the German Protestant theologian cannot help but think most sympathetically of the clerical soldier on the other side, since many thousands of his young German colleagues are out in the field. We welcomed for this reason as a fine proof of chivalrousness the command of our Kaiser, already issued a few months ago, that those captive French soldiers who give sufficient evidence of their clerical standing, in Germany should be treated as officers, even though they do not have the rank of an officer.

. . . The Imperial order is one of those tender cords which through humane treatment in the midst of the war secretly begins to unite two opponents, between whom seemingly all intercourse had been cut off. It lies, in the nature of the war, that these delicate threads can be tied at first only through the attitude we take towards the prisoners and especially the wounded among them.

In this respect more is being done in both countries than is known to the public. I recently read a letter, which a French Protestant pastor's wife in Cherbourg, Madame Rosa Brand, wrote to a family, here in Berlin, whose son died at the cause of a severe wound, after he had received the most faithful spiritual help from the pastor and his wife. This letter is a remarkable document of humane feeling and Christian brotherly love.

I can assure you that with us also, the wounded of the enemy, find good care and faithful attention. Our German soldiers hardly receive a better treatment than do the French or Russian wounded prisoners in the garrison-hospital of Wünsdorf near Berlin, which I had occasion to visit during the month of October. The

indirect correspondence with a colleague, Monsieur Doumergue, in the Protestant theological faculty of Montauban in South France caused me a special joy. Upon my request, which had been conveyed to him through the medium of a Swiss colleague, Mr. Doumergue took a personal interest in the son of my gardener, a young pioneer from the guards who with severe wounds was interned as prisoner in Montauban. Of course, I then, upon his counter-request, gladly undertook to investigate the whereabouts of two young missing French soldiers, and for weeks have been in correspondence with the German "Central Bureau of Help to Prisoners" as well as with the many Prisoners' Camps throughout Germany. As yet I do not know whether I will be able to find them, but this little incident, which one would hardly dare to mention under normal conditions, has strengthened my conviction, that even the war has not erased all traces of Christian brotherly feeling. . . .

Jan. 29, 1915.

During these last days I have carried about in my mind a figure which I learned to know and which I will never forget. A young volunteer in the front, so my friend Prof. Martin Rade in Marburg writes, heard a German regiment of the Territorials (*Landwehr*) sing our Christmas song "Silent night, holy night". As a telephonist he had the opportunity to visit these comrades in their trenches, and on one occasion learned how many children the soldiers of this regiment, nearly all of whom were married, had left behind in the home-land. Nine thousand children! I think that all who give some thought to this figure, will learn thereby, if they do not know it already, what war really means. How many of these nine thousand boys and girls will see their fathers again?

In this connection, the detailed letter of a young

Lancer (Ulan), one of our theological student-volunteers, who for several semesters was a member of my pro-seminar and seminar here at the university, gave me an especial joy. During the entire time of his military training and for the first weeks in the field his mind was continually occupied by a passage in Romans; now he believes to have found the solution and is happy and satisfied about it. From Ardoye in West Flanders he writes the following:—

"During last summer's semester I heard your Exegesis of Romans. . . . Many passages disquieted me and again made me happy. However, there was one which bothered me very much. I knew it involved an essential element in our conception of Christ. All other expositions did not satisfy me. What I refer to are the remarkable words of Paul in chapter 3: 21–26, especially v. 25. Well, as I said, the statement here troubled me throughout the semester without my finding a satisfactory conclusion. War broke out and as a volunteer I entered the 3rd regiment of Lancers in Fürstenwalde.

"My studies naturally came to a close, but not the burning question in regard to the passage mentioned above. If I give you, my dear professor, in brief my thoughts and considerations about these words of the Apostle, I do it with the happy consciousness of having become content and quiet. I would like to ask you to examine my exegesis. Of course now, while I am writing, the original is not at my disposal, for I am already out in the field; but during the long hours in our quarters I at least have the time to give you the translation which I finished in the garrison and took along with me. These are the words:—

"V. 21—But now apart from the law, God's righteousness has been manifested, having been witnessed by the law and the prophets—22—even God's righteousness through (in consequence of) the faith of Jesus Christ unto (*i. e.* with reference to) all them that believe (*i. e.*

who have the faith of Jesus Christ). For there is no distinction,—23—for all have sinned and fall short (cannot obtain) the glory of God;—24—being (now) accounted righteous freely by his grace as a result of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,—25—, to whom God set forth publicly as a sign of propitiation, in consequence of the faith, (which he even preserved) in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God,—26—for the showing of his righteousness at this present season; that he himself be truly just; and (in truth) accounts righteous him that is of the faith of Jesus (*i. e.* who shares the same faith with Jesus). What bothered me most was v. 25. It was not clear to me where the phrase "in his blood" belonged. My understanding of the whole passage hinges on these words. "In his blood" must necessarily belong to "in consequence of his faith"! And this faith is not the faith of men in Christ but the faith of Christ himself. Only he who is of this faith can recognize the righteousness of God (c. 26). It is not the faith in Christ's blood, neither is it the faith in the fellowship of Christ's blood, but it is the faith of Jesus Christ himself, which approved itself to the last and utmost. As a result of this faith he is a sign of propitiation set forth by God before the whole world. I, therefore, take the expression in Christ Jesus in a local sense without necessarily thinking of the pneumatic Christ. In this suffering and much enduring Christ lies our redemption, since the just God accounts him truly righteous who has such faith as Jesus had. Throughout the whole passage I think of the historic Christ rather than of the pneumatic. The present tense "being justified" may be used in a general way, and need not be taken as referring to the present being laid hold on by the pneumatic Christ. But this is of little consequence here. All that interests me is to know that the faith in v. 25 is Christ's faith and not the faith in Christ.

"I am so glad to still be able to pen you these lines hoping that you will receive them right soon, for who knows how long we may yet remain undisturbed in our quarters."

This explanation, which practically almost agrees with that held by Johannes Haussleiter, takes our redemption as conditioned by the fidelity of the faith of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which he proved to the utmost even to his death on the cross. Don't you think that, on the other hand, this explanation was probably suggested through the psychological condition of the young soldier, who is ready, every day, to give the highest proof of faithfulness—the sacrifice of his own life? I count this exegesis of Rom. 3: 21–26, be it tenable philologically or not, in any case as having immanent value, because it mirrors great facts of the hidden religious life and unveils mysterious interchanging effects within the world of revelation.

Feb. 5, 1915.

. . . The strong revival of religious interest that the war has brought about with us, has deeply stirred our Church-life throughout the whole of Evangelical Germany. Quite a number of our clergymen have told me that now it was a pleasure to be a pastor. . . . Today I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the strong desire for God's word and constraining brotherly love have been the cause of new arrangements and the creation of a number of organisations in our congregations which did not exist before the war. Externally regarded the most remarkable feature is a new type of service, the so-called "*Kriegsgebetstunde*", the prayer-meeting on behalf of the country and its soldiers. From the beginning of the great conflict until up to this day these hours for prayer and devotion have been greatly in demand both in our cities and in the rural districts. The number of regular hours of worship proved too few

and consequently these prayer-meetings were arranged. The people usually gather on weekday evenings either in the churches or in halls; the service is short but intensive, song and prayer occupy first place; an address is not always given, but if so, brief and to the point. In the country these hours of prayer and quiet devotion are sometimes held at noon-day, and the men and women come to church directly from their labor in workday clothes; on that account they are not less worshipful, and afterwards they again take up their daily task with new strength and the encouragement which this fellowship in prayer grants.

In a small Brandenburgian village, where I have my summer-home "Anatolia", which is not quite unknown to some of my American friends, I, myself, had occasion during last August to attend these evening hours for prayer, and I must confess that they belong to the most impressive religious services I have ever attended. The small church-building, dimly lit by candles, was crowded to the doors with worshippers, most of whom could not be recognized, but the great common feeling of humbling oneself under God's will, of joyful confidence and patriotic devotion, united all of us. . . .

In Berlin, too, our great metropolis, these hours of prayer in behalf of our country and its fighting forces play an important role. It is always a touching experience, when in the evening one drives through the immense crowds on the streets, brilliantly illuminated just as before the war, and suddenly, at an unexpected hour, the deep tones of a church-bell close by, resound amidst and above the noise of the traffic on the thoroughfares. In some churches both these prayer-meetings and the regular services are so overcrowded, if one wants to get a place, one must be present long before the beginning of the exercises. . . .

A peculiar effect the war has also had on the inner life of our immense congregations here in Berlin, where

churches are found having a membership of over 100,000. Wilmersdorf, for instance, a suburb which within a few years grew from a village to a modern city of about 141,000 inhabitants (a growth which we are accustomed to call "American") naturally had a congregational life before the war which still was little developed. The thousands upon thousands, (who often like nomads move from one place to the other), do not know each other and therefore do not have the feeling of belonging together, as is the case in a small church where the numbers can easily be controlled. Here the war has brought a hopeful new beginning.

At the instigation of a young pastor, ladies of the better educated class have united to lighten the burden of those women whose husbands are defending the country. Since State and City provide in an excellent manner for the bodily need, it is not so much that they help financially, though this is done also; their aim in the main is rather to come in contact with these women through friendly intercourse and the most simple forms of human association, and thus to make them forget the oppressive loneliness, which often overcomes them, especially since a number have already lost some loved one on the battlefield. . . .

It is also remarkable that many congregations, influenced by the war, have put themselves to an entirely new task, which otherwise lay quite outside of their field of interest; what I mean now, is the life-insurance of such members who must needs take up arms for their fatherland. Since it is probably always best to give actual occurrence, I should like to cite an incident with which I personally am familiar. In the Taunus mountains near Frankfort on the Main, we find the beautiful resort "Königstein"; the evangelical congregation, which stands under the leadership of my friend Bender, the court preacher of the Grandduchess of Luxemburg, scarcely numbers 500 souls and yet has 60 men out in

the field. Already a few weeks after the outbreak of the war my friend was able to write (Postal dated Oct. 5. '14): "At my proposal the members of my congregation took out a life-insurance policy for each man actively engaged in the war. If the taxes are not sufficient to cover the expense, we will simply raise them accordingly. This was unanimously voted upon". Is this resolution not proof of genuine Christian solidarity? In a most modern fashion, inspired by the war, the old Christian "*Koinonia*" (communism) of the Acts celebrates new triumphs. . . .

Feb. 12, 1915.

The mutual effects existing between the war and religion are two-fold. On the one hand religion, in its national extent, is most deeply influenced by the war, and on the other, the terrific struggle affects the piety of the individual in various ways. Of course, it is impossible to separate entirely the general social effects of the conflict from the impression made upon the individual. All the various experiences of the single man finally flow together in the great stream of religious life, as it is expressed by the entire nation; and each one individually is now, while the fight is going on, borne up by the spirit of the people as a whole. But however simple and massive the features of our social and national religious life as strengthened by the war may be, the effects, which this unprecedented situation has upon the individual soul, vary very greatly. The religious psychology of the individual soldier defending his country, is as complicated as the condition of the whole army, viewed from a religious standpoint, is comparatively simple. And again, the spiritual atmosphere of our congregations at home is as easily grasped as the right estimate of what is going on in the soul of the individual is quite difficult and uncertain.

I would like to call your attention today to one single profession, whose inner attitude must naturally be of

great importance as to the influence it has upon our religious life—I mean the theologians of our Evangelical church. In my last letter I cited the expression often heard during the last months from the mouths of clergymen, viz.: that it is a delight now to be a pastor, and in it I find not only the intensification of their own spiritual forces caused by the war but also the joy expressed over the strong revival of Christian congregation life, where the preacher and personal worker now find a greater readiness to receive than ever before.

This is equally as true with reference to the pastoral work at home, as it holds good out in the front, where many of our theologians have found a field of activity either through their calling or as volunteer division and hospital chaplains. . . .

My cousin, pastor Carl Deissmann, who is stationed in France as volunteer army-chaplain in the 18th Army-corps, writes me that he feels himself incapable of describing the momentous and uplifting element experienced in his work, and that he wishes he might transport every pessimist in the church into his present field of labor. As a result of their intercourse with the soldiers, who are so thankful for every word of comfort given them, their pessimism would vanish in a cloud.

I certainly do not wish to exaggerate, for I know that much of this high psychical tension resulting from the war will again ebb when peace is restored. Nevertheless, I cannot believe that the impressions, stamped upon the souls of our pastors and religious leaders through this conflict, will ever vanish, and therefore I have the firm conviction that the next five decades will have evident traces of this heightening of our spiritual forces to show up.

Feb. 26, 1915.

The general uplift brought about by the war and most evident in the sphere of religious thought, finds

expression also in a remarkable fact, which may be told in two lines but speaks volumes, more than many a long story: from the declaration of war until into the late fall of 1914 about 1½ million new patriotic songs were written and printed. For this estimate I am indebted to *Geh. Rat* Dr. Max Friedländer, an authority on history of music, who may perhaps not be unknown to some among you as the German Exchange Professor at Harvard University in the winter of 1910–11. The innumerable unprinted poems are not included.

It is impossible for me to even make an attempt in judging this enormous production of poetry as to its literary value. No one is capable of doing this, nor will any one ever be. The mere fact of this immense quantity may act as a guide in forming an opinion on the mental attitude of Germany's millions during this world-embracing conflict. Side by side with the well-known names of our national poets of the present age stand those of thousands of unknown, whose poetic vein was awakened by the unusual events of this general conflagration. Old and young and extremely young, men and women, farmers and business-men, ulans, artillerists and pioneers, seamen and pilots of air-craft, deaconesses, physicians, students and pupils, army generals and University professors compete with politicians and men of administrative ability. Judging this mass of literature from a purely artistic standpoint, there is no doubt but that much of it is murky, although well-meant, and worthless trash; but as a manifestation of the country's soul, it is, taken as a whole, something stirringly great, like a huge phenomenon in nature. The most intensive mental and spiritual life of the nation can only find expression in the pathos of poetry.

In close connection with this poetic outburst stands the mobilization of music (if we may call it so) which I touched upon in my first letter; that German sacred concert given in the cathedral of Laon in France, which

I at that time mentioned as typical in this respect, has become a permanent institution. The program of the ninth service at Laon, published by Gertrud Bäumer, opened with a choral prelude of Bach ("*Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme*"), whereupon the entire congregation while standing sang the transcription of this choral by Geibel. The "German Soldiers Male-Chorus of Laon" then sang Gluck's "Prayer" and Mozart's song of dedication "*O Schutzgeist alles Schoenen*". Then an organ and violin solo (Liszt and Händel) followed as well as a Baritone aria from "*Paulus*" and "*Judas Maccabeus*". The entire congregation closed the service by singing the Dutch prayer of thanksgiving: "*Wir treten zum Beten vor Gott den Gerechten*".

In one of my letters I spoke of the possibility that at the close of the war, the religious awakening, brought about by the general onslaught of the nations, partially at least would relapse again. It is a spiritual law that a period of high tension is followed by one of rest. Nevertheless it would be a great mistake, on that account to idly fold one's hands and allow one's grateful joy over the obtained results to be disturbed by the resigned wisdom that after the war is over everything will again become as it was before its outbreak. On the contrary it is already our earnest endeavor to see to it that as far as possible the newly revived forces will be active after peace has been again restored.

This great task occupied an imposing assembly of Protestant clergymen of Greater-Berlin a few days ago, which, upon the invitation of Dr. Lahusen, General Superintendent of the churches in Berlin took place in the Trinity Church (*Dreifaltigkeitskirche*), where Schleiermacher once held his service. Dr. Lahusen himself, in his welcoming address, pointed out some specific tasks which he considered as most urging for the Evangelical Church after the war; he mentioned the form in which the relation between State and Church may find its ex-

pression, he touched upon the solution of the social question by the Church, and also called attention to the attitude of the Church in regard to social-democracy. . . .

Of all the problems that were put before the assembly, I consider the question as to the attitude of the Church to Socialism and the social problem the most burning one. The war has proven that even in this largest political body in Germany, which, in times of peace often appeared to be hostile to religion, there is both warm patriotism and distinct religious feeling. I, myself, together with many others never expected anything else from our social-democrats, especially since I learned to know them better in South Germany. But I know that the socialistic party was judged quite differently in other countries, in Great Britain for example. Many expected a German socialistic revolution at the outbreak of the war. Quite in the contrary; hundreds of thousands of our socialists are in the ranks of our fighting armies, just as reliable and patriotic as the rest, and their share in the great national sacrifice of human lives and fortunes is large indeed. That religious motives have much to say with many of them is illustrated in the example of Dr. Ludwig Frank of Mannheim, delegate of the socialistic party in the Reichstag. He was a volunteer, but fell, early in the war, as a hero in the defense of his country. I knew him personally, when still in Heidelberg, and worked together with him in the University Extension movement. He was a Jew and the religious forces that had been cultivated in the home of his devout parents, besides other considerations, determined his resolution to hasten to the protection of his country's flag.

From this it appears that the German Social-Democracy will be different after the conflict from what it was in the opinion of many people, before it entered into the great war-path, and even those who have judged them rightly, will notice with them a great inner uplift. It will be up to the Church to care for these faithful

comrades on the battlefield in a motherly way, and to recompense their heroic defense of the country with the same measure of confidence and love which it shows to all other countrymen.

March 12, 1915.

Every war gives rise to an immense number of false individual reports. The psychology of war-gossip is in its main features always the same, whether the struggle be carried on in South Africa or in France. During the Boer war "a Kafir" was the notorious authority for such tales, so that in Germany even today false reports are occasionally called "Kafir-tales". In this present world-shaking conflict the "Kafir" is substituted by "a relative", "a captured serjeant", "an army-nurse", etc., or by "a commercial traveller who came over the Dutch frontier". As a rule one should subject all reports that are based on such authorities to the severest criticism. Accounts which are not personally signed and dated nor indicate the exact location, and such whose authority is not backed up by the name of an absolutely trustworthy personality, should only be regarded as sources of second and third rate, even then when such detailed information is apparently given, forgery repeatedly has been established, or to say the least, the accused party was given no hearing. Therefore, every one who wants the truth, should seek to obtain as much lucid and trustworthy material as possible and thus destroy the tissue of lies which hatred has woven wherever he can. . . .

"Our own correspondent", "a friend of the correspondents", "a French priest"! Three soap bubbles! And yet these soap bubbles strike Christian charity like a cannon ball. . . . My colleague, Prof. Reinhold Seeberg, in a conversation recently said to me, never in his life had he seen the reality of evil in so tangible a form as in this war; and I was compelled to assent. The very fact that the lie is crawling and sometimes even

flying around the globe is an incarnation of evil itself, and never before has it raised its head in a more demon-like way. I will accuse no individual, and pharisaic sentiment I honestly oppose. But it often deeply distresses me, when I foresee the disaster being wrought among the nations by falsehood and perversity.

And yet, in spite of these agonizing dissonances of the universal conflagration, our faith cannot fail. A few days ago I saw a picture which greeted me like a symbol of the Divine Power of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, which is indestructible and still at work even behind the terrible facts of the present hour. Near Saarburg in Lorraine, on a battlefield, Prince William of Hohenzollern photographed a field-crucifix, which had been struck and destroyed by a shell. By a miracle, almost, as the writing under the picture expressly states, the crucified Christ himself was spared, and we actually see how the completely intact and lofty figure of the Master towers up only loosely fastened on the high, partially destroyed base, contrasting most sharply to the dim light of the wildly moved and cloudy sky, and marvellous enough: the arms, before nailed high to the cross-beam, but freed from the wood through the shell, now seem to stretch across the wide battlefield, laying hold on the country and at the same time pronouncing the benediction. Under these arms extended in blessing, those who are separated today, will at some time again be reunited:—this is the common hope of the Christians.

April 1, 1915.

. . . The conciliatory effect of this [spiritual] movement upon the inner-churchly situation I have occasionally mentioned in these letters. Today I can report of a very tangible result of this reconciling sentiment, which is to be welcomed all the more as it was achieved upon the difficult ground of Berlin soil. On the 18th of March after confidential negotiations, representatives of

the three Protestant parties in our churches here published the following agreement regarding their church elections:—"In the autumn of this year we face the legally prescribed elections of the new members to our administrative bodies in most of the congregations of the synodal district of Berlin. In a time when all of our people unanimously have but one aim before them, viz.: to conquer the outer foe and to gain a lasting peace for their country, it appears necessary to refrain from inner struggles and to let arms rest, above all in the Church. The undersigned representatives of the orthodox and liberal parties have agreed upon the following resolutions:

1. "We guarantee each other the full number of seats we are holding now on April 1, 1915, and that the respective parties remain in possession of them for the chief elections due in the fall of this year and in the year 1916. If changes occur in the various departments, the same principles are to hold good."
2. "We guarantee this status also at the by-election up to the next chief election in 1918."
3. "No agitation for signatures to the election-lists of the churches shall take place."
4. "No assemblies of the voters of the respective parties."
5. "No party circulars,"
6. "No press feuds,"
7. "No fetching of voters on election-days."
8. "The undersigned representatives of the orthodox and liberal parties, or their respective substitutes must be regarded as a court of arbitration in matters of dispute during the time of this agreement. We make this hearty and urgent appeal to all voters of the Church, in order to insure the welfare of the country and of the Church in a peaceful progress of the elections."

This document was signed in the name of the "orthodox party" by the Government architect (*Baurat*) Boettcher,

the merchant Deyhle, the College President Dr. Evers, Pastor Lange, Commissioner of Police von Loebell, Pastor Dr. Philipps, Pastor Schwartzkopff, Director of the City-Mission of Berlin; in the name of the "liberal party" by Rector Blauert, Councillor of Justice Hallensleben, Pastor Dr. Kirmss, the teacher Kroll, Pastor Niedlich, the Inspector of Schools Dr. Schepp, the merchant Weidling; in the name of the "Evangelical Union", the so-called middle party, by the Ecclesiastical (*Geh. Konsistorialrat*) Dr. Scholz, the Ecclesiastical Supt. Mr. Steinbach.

This resolution bearing on the inner-protestant situation is as gratifying as the following declaration which concerns the inter-denominational relationship between the German Protestants and Roman Catholics. Already on January 4, 1915 the "Evangelical Union", (*Evangelischer Bund*), now numbering over 510,000 members, founded in the interests of German Protestantism, issued this joyful confession toward interdenominational peace.

"The great war has brought us an interdenominational peace, which we will keep loyally and whose development we will watch to the best of our storm-tossed country.

"Freed from the previously necessary, but little gratifying task of warding off the opponent, we now, during this period of our gigantic struggle, have been able to co-operate in the interest [of] deepening the German and Evangelical feeling through our large Press-activity, through our Church papers, our contributions to the daily papers, our war-literature, and through the arrangement of patriotic and popular lectures. Our charity work in behalf of those afflicted by the war, through our growing sisterhood, which fully stands the test, as well as our activity in behalf of the Evangelical congregations in the country of our Austrian allies brings with it considerable furtherance and demands energetic support."

Although, as a matter of course, it happens that in single cases, people still fall back into the old way of

quarrelling, yet it may be safely said that the overwhelming majority within the two big denominations of Germany has, at present, not the least desire for it. A few days ago I had an opportunity to attend, as a guest, a most interesting Roman-Catholic mass-meeting in the Philharmonie here in Berlin, and I warmly assented, even from my Protestant standpoint, when the speaker objected to an unbrotherly criticism of the Catholics made by a non-Catholic writer. . . .

The speaker was the Bishop of Speyer, Dr. von Faulhaber, a former well-known colleague of mine in Biblical research, and as such a credit to the University of Strassburg. Still comparatively young in years, he was then made Bishop of an important diocese. The manly appearance of the highly honored personage with its almost military and yet elastic bearing fitted exceptionally well in this iron age, which has brought about the most gigantic struggle the world has ever seen. The Bishop who has served in the army as a student, has just returned from the battle-fields of the West-front, where he has had opportunity to hold touching field-services.

His subject was: "The war in the light of the Gospel". Although strongly condemning "Martialism" or warlikeness, as well as "Sabbatism", or readiness for peace even at the cost of the highest possessions, Dr. von Faulhaber proved from the Bible that there is such a thing as a justified war. His strong address, full of striking and spirited points was a well taken apology for the justness of our war. He closed it, warning on the one hand against the nourishment of race-hatred as well as the moral dangers threatening the soldiers, on the other hand finishing up with the solemn promise to preserve for the time of peace the good will which today joins all parties and creeds in united action for their country. Of course, there were a number of statements in the address of the Bishop, which a Protestant theologian would have avoided or at least worded differently; but taken

as a whole this presentation of our present situation from a Roman Catholic standpoint was ecumenical in the best sense of the word. Therefore, as a non-Catholic, I could heartily join in the applause which the great leader received. . . .

April 16, 1915.

. . . It is, I suppose, not unknown to you that the former kind feelings of the German people toward England have, since the beginning of this terrible struggle, become very bitter, and he who understands the situation, will know why this bitterness has taken such deep root. Nevertheless, we know that in spite of the terrible seriousness of this raging conflict, hatred must not retain the upper hand, and prominent Christian leaders in Germany have raised their voice against such an attitude. One of the most remarkable features in this respect is probably a sermon held recently by Dr. Friedrich Lahusen, Superintendent General of the Berlin Synod. His theme was "The fifth Petition of the Lord's Prayer and England" and the result was that afterwards thousands upon thousands of printed copies of this address were sold. Through the kindness of a friend I am in the fortunate position to send you a reprint of the same, and I consider it a most valuable contribution to the development of a better understanding between Christian nations in these distressing days. The donor of this gift is Dr. Spiecker, director of the Siemens-Schuckert Works in Siemensstadt near Berlin, one of the largest industrial establishments in Germany. Mr. Spiecker is a man equally distinguished for his unusual business capacity and for his charitable and philanthropic deeds of practical Christianity. This instance goes to show that not only leading personalities in the Church are opposed to race-hatred but also prominent representatives of our economic life as well, and that in spite of the war and right in the midst of it. "Hatred looks

as if it were something powerful," says Dr. Lahusen, "but it is nothing but weakness. . . . In giving way to hate we lose God; God is not in hate. . . . We cannot have God and at the same time manifest pharisaic self-righteousness, which puts the blame only on the enemy. . . . Let us hate the satanic powers of haughtiness and selfishness, of treason and cruelty, of falsehood and hypocrisy . . . but we do not hate man. . . . We fight in the service of God." . . .

April 23, 1915.

[Dr. William Adams Brown of Union Theological Seminary having expressed a friendly wish for evidence of "the existence of the same spirit of Christian charity and forgiveness toward enemies in Germany, of which this enclosed pamphlet[1] is an example in England," Dr. Deissmann replies:]

Already in my 20th letter I unknowingly fulfilled Dr. Brown's wish by meeting him on common ground. I believe that especially the sermon of Dr. Lahusen sufficiently manifests that spirit of Christian love and forgiveness toward enemies. Today I will add a seemingly insignificant occurrence which, however, as I believe, illustrates the same attitude toward Christ's command.

Some time ago an English soldier of 22 years died in a military hospital in Weimar from tetanus, because he had been seriously wounded in Flanders. Before entering the English army, the young man had been a labourer in Derby. He was buried with military honors, Pastor Diakonus Weyrich in Weimar giving the memorial address. The father of the soldier, a factory worker in Derby, received a detailed account of his death as well as of the honorable burial of the son who had died so far away from his home. The funeral sermon held by the *Diakonus* has just appeared in print in the Monthly "*Evangelische Freiheit*", 8th War-Number, March 15, and is a telling document of the above mentioned spirit

[1] "Call to Prayer in This Time of Trouble", issued by the "Collegium" in London, of which Mr. William Temple is chairman.

of brotherly love even toward the enemy. "What the hate of man and his imperfections tear asunder, our God unites again." . . . "The individual, to whatever nation he may belong, is our friend and brother in Christ" . . . "To this Christian brother also the words of our Master refer, when he says in Jo. 6: 37: 'All that which the Father gives me shall come unto me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out!'" . . . "He who stakes his life in the faithful performance of duty in order to serve his country and his people—such an one belongs to God." . . . "In this manner a brave soldier on the enemy's side, who has faithfully endured, can win our respect, and serve as a pattern on our journey through life."

I believe with Dr. Brown, that only such a spirit as portrayed in these words spoken at the grave of the English soldier in Weimar, has the promise to act constructively in a period of most awful destruction.

While thinking over the message that my letters are intended to convey, I have often asked myself whether my general viewpoint of the religious situation as presented by the war, was correct in every point. I willingly admit that I am not infallible and that errors may have crept into my opinions or estimates. Living right in the midst of this fearful struggle and following each phase with the most intense feeling day and night, I naturally am not always able to look at things with the same cool objectiveness, with which I would for instance observe the usage of a N. T. word in a Pisidian inscription. Nevertheless I have reason to believe that on the whole I am judging things rightly, because a scholar from the southern part of our country, who views the situation from an altogether different standpoint and in an entirely different way, in the main reaches the same conclusion as I do. Since I am a Protestant theologian and judge from experiences gathered chiefly here in Berlin, North Germany, it was especially valuable to me to hear

the opinion of a Roman Catholic colleague in Freiburg-in-the-Breisgau, South Germany. Dr. Georg Pfeilschifter, a prominent theologian, and an authority on the interdenominational life of the present time, especially of the Churches in the East, has just recently published a book, "Religion and Religions in this World Struggle." He reaches the following general conclusion about the present situation.

"A conclusive statement in regard to all the religious experiences in this World War and the place religion really holds in it, is of course, not yet possible. Nevertheless, based on the material already on hand, a few facts may even now be established.

" Even if the various religions and creeds in their relationships one to another here and there play a role in this war, nowhere did they furnish the motive for the origin of the same. No nation is carrying on a religious war, not even Turkey. The same religions or creeds have just as little acted as a uniting bond, as their opposing differences have acted as a severing hindrance. The Christian nations of Europe no more form a solidarity over against the colored heathen of Asia and Africa.

"Everywhere however, with the soldiers at the front as well as with the non-combatants at home, religion as an inner experience in daily life takes an important place. In every nation the religious forces are gathered and used in a high degree.

" Nevertheless, we must take heed in drawing rash conclusions from this state of affairs and not speak of a religious regeneration of the entire German nation. We hope that this will take place in the future, but just now it has not yet come to pass. Now is the time of sowing and of growth, but the harvest season is not yet. It would be fatal, should we at present mistake this high-water mark of the extraordinary, of the heroic, of the enthusiastic in our religious life for that religious New Birth. This high tension of religious feeling during the

war will not be lasting. Our religious life will settle down to a constant normal state as soon as the bitter struggle comes to a close. Not until then will we know how much we have grown in true Christian faith and in the quiet but lasting virtues of Christian morality.

"But even now I believe we may point to two phenomena as being lasting achievements of our religious life. The first is the experience that the Christian religion has proved itself anew an heroic religion, creating valiant heroes in active fighting as well as in patient enduring. This conflict shows us that Christianity is by no means a religion for women and children only, for weaklings and effeminate men, but a religion which just enfolds the highest active and passive powers of the soul in courageous and strong men. And the second is the faith in the guidance of our nation by our Lord and God, who not only governs the destinies of individual man, but also determines those of the nations. Divine providence, as we firmly believe today, has made us one of the greatest nations on earth and we trust its guidance to lead us on in the future."

I can endorse all this almost word for word; that passage especially, which warns us in over-estimating the intensified religious life of the present,—but I am just as little inclined to underestimate it.

Education and the Constructive Aim

By Edward A. Pace, Ph.D., S.T.D.,
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

In a very important sense, the constructive aim is educational. It seeks to bring out in clear statements the beliefs that are held by different bodies of Christians and to remove those misunderstandings which are due to exaggeration, inaccuracy or traditional perversion. It has also in view the development of a mental temper which shall be willing to hear calmly the other sides and to evaluate each solely with reference to the truth as Christ taught it. No educative process, surely, could have a broader field or a purpose of greater moment.

Directly and primarily, the work appeals to adults. Both those who give and those who receive information have weighed the issues and toiled at the problems in the light of their personal experience and with the power of matured judgment. Moreover, they approach the task with settled convictions as to the necessity of religion and especially the need of winning back for Christianity the world-saving power which unity of faith implies.

But the accomplishment of this aim is not intended to benefit those only who are consciously striving for it. In the nature of things, the full advantage is reserved for a later generation. What cannot be completely achieved in our day may nevertheless be inaugurated and furthered in the hope that each year will add new interest and force to the movement.

Is the hope well founded?

Let us suppose that the desired result were already attained and that the only urgent question were that of making Christian unity permanent. Attention would naturally center upon those who were just emerging from the educative process, and after them upon those who were about to begin it. In that case, the decisive factor would be the school. Education in the narrower sense would determine whether and how far the work of construction should proceed. Supposing further that education had followed consistently and successfully its actual trend, we may pertinently ask: What aid would it offer to Christianity? To what extent would it be a transmission of our spiritual inheritance?

It is obvious to say that construction requires a foundation, but it also requires materials. The chief cornerstone indeed is there, but what of those who are to be built upon it and framed together into an holy temple? If it appear that, a generation hence, there shall be found the same earnest seeking, the same vivid realization of the need of unity among the followers of Christ, in a word, the same faith and devotion to the cause of religion, there is reason even now to believe that the present endeavour is not useless. Its success would be assured if all the agencies which give direction to thought were enlisted on the side of religion, for Christianity would then have an open field. But what may we expect if influences are to prevail which militate not only against this or that form of belief but against religion itself? Will there be anything left to be taken up by the constructive movement, to say nothing of carrying it forward?

One need not turn pessimist in surveying the present situation, but one should not, on the other hand, cherish the illusion that somehow all will be well in spite of adverse influences and tendencies to which no adequate check is offered. Much less is it the part of wisdom to let specious argument spread the conviction that the

separation of religion and education is conducive to the prosperity of both and to the public welfare. The Christian certainly cannot acknowledge in "citizenship", "efficiency" or "culture", a substitute for faith and character.

The attempt at substitution has proceeded steadily though not violently for more than half a century. At first the common school, as its name implied, was intended to give all the people the benefits of education. When this aim, excellent in itself, had been generally endorsed, it was found impracticable to allow the teaching of religion in any definite form for the reason that no form would satisfy everybody. The common school thus became "non-sectarian", and this latter title, though practically equivalent to "non-religious", became a badge of distinction, of breadth and progressiveness as opposed to the alleged narrowness and immobility of the sectarian institution. There was some regret, perhaps, that things should have taken this course, but then it appeared to be the only course possible under the circumstances. Incidentally, the term "separatist" was transferred to the schools which stood out for education combined with religion; for it was claimed that these kept their pupils apart from the environment in which the future citizen received his training. It was not considered necessary to examine very closely the results of this training; it was simply assumed in a large way that intellectual keenness and abundance of knowledge must produce the right sort of citizenship. At all events, the result was in part a modification of the ideal of citizenship and in part a willingness to accept, as the final outcome, the assertion that education can be, and is, quite complete without any religious element.

This gradual elimination of religion from the practice, and even from the meaning, of education is the more significant because during the same period every subject, useful or otherwise, has been introduced into the school.

To "enrich the curriculum" has become, apparently, the main purpose of those who wield authority in educational matters. There have been some meek protests about the effect of this superabundant diet upon the assimilative powers of the pupil, but they have not checked the expansion of the curriculum; for it seemed good to make the mass of school knowledge grow and let the learners develop—if they could. It almost looked as though the "complete living" were to be accomplished before the "preparation" for it was over. But in all this richness there was no place for religion.

There was no formal declaration against the utility of religion for life; in fact, no such declaration was necessary. The negative object lesson was quite sufficient. Since the course of study included everything that was worth while, and since it did not include religion, the inference was clear; and it was promptly drawn, with or without the help of logic, by pupil and parent alike. It was not of course explicitly stated, but it was quietly accepted; it leavened the "apperception mass" of the popular mind until this was prepared by fact rather than by argument for the enunciation of the principle that education could very well dispense with religious knowledge. But if education is complete without religion, why not "living" also?

Religion did not thereupon disappear as an object of study: it was too intimately bound up with the experience and the evolution of the race to be altogether cast aside. It holds today even a larger place than ever before in the programme of advanced education. It offers an attractive field for the investigations of historian, philologist and psychologist. The evolution of dogma and the varieties of religious experience are considered to be worthy of scientific treatment, while the Sacred Books of any and every people offer endless problems in the study of language. All this is interesting—with about the same interest that is offered by the Iliad or any collection of Sagas. Religion being a phenomenon of the human mind,

it deserves careful attention, just as do custom and convention; and being for the most part a thing of the past, it rightfully claims a place in archaeology. Christianity is admitted on the same basis as other systems of belief, and the Constructive Effort itself will in due time be recognized as one of the religious "movements", a phenomenon to be studied like the rest.

The attitude established by such courses of study—say in the university graduate—calls for no comment; it plainly has little sympathy with any endeavour to restore all things in Christ. But since, in the present order of things, secondary and even elementary education is higher education in miniature—drawn to scale as it were—one should not be surprised to see, sooner or later, a primer of religion prepared in strictly scientific form and adopted as the final enrichment of the curriculum. It would do no more harm, certainly, than Aesop or Homer.

An inquiry into the real causes of the situation should not set out with the assumption that they are all of one kind. There are people who will hear nothing of religious education just because in their estimation religion is of no value; and with these the discussion would have to begin on a different level. But there are many others whose opposition is based on a misunderstanding in regard to the scope and nature of religious education. They cannot see why school and church, though separate, should not work harmoniously, each performing its own special function, nor can they persuade themselves that much will be gained for the educative process by encumbering it with a sort of teaching which, as they think, is radically different from every other kind of instruction.

Such persons evidently have in mind the requirements of the educative process as this is now understood, and they will probably be interested, if not surprised, when the statement is made that the ground they stand on is precisely that which supports the claim in behalf of religion. In fact, a fundamental reason for including

religion in education is supplied by psychology. Once granted that religion is something worth knowing, the very principles on which modern education is based require that religious truth should be imparted along with other kinds of truth. If it is merely an appendix to them, it will not be correlated, it will not be lifted up into the mental structure or properly assimilated, and it will have no functional value. If it is to exert an influence upon conduct, it must be woven into the fiber of the developing mind and become the dominant factor in mental life. This, however, cannot be accomplished unless religion become a part of the everyday school programme and be taught by the same general methods that control the teaching of other subjects.

As preliminary to the formulation of methods there is needed an understanding of religion itself. It is quite probable that much of the opposition to the teaching of religion in the school is due to incorrect notions regarding the subject. Those who look upon religion as simply an affair of the emotions will naturally be reluctant to give it a place, much less the central place, in a scheme of education, especially in a scheme that only claims to develop intelligence and to provide it with knowledge. To those on the other hand who think that religion consists merely in knowing the things that are to be believed, or in holding fast the articles of faith, no very close relation between religious instruction and the teaching of other subjects will appear desirable; they may even apprehend some danger from such daily contact and hence may prefer that the knowledge of things sacred should be held apart from ordinary treatment even as the things themselves are kept away from profane uses. For still different reasons, the idea that religion is a life of benefaction without dogmas or beliefs, will deter many persons from advocating formal religious instruction: these at most will insist that altruistic aims be encouraged and that children be impressed with the beauty of service.

Considering this diversity of opinion as to the nature of religion, one might suspect that those who officially and in virtue of their authority exclude religion from the school, have a stronger defence to offer than is furnished by the usually cited disagreement on points of belief among professing Christians. Just as the severing of the bond of unity has placed Christianity at a disadvantage in its dealings with the world at large, so and to an even greater extent, these conflicting views regarding the essential meaning of religion have been both a rock of offence to its opponents and a pretext for their opposition.

The clash of opinions is the outcome of a splintering process. Some one element in religion has been singled out to the exclusion of the rest and it has proved inadequate to the strain of criticism, thus bringing upon the concept of religion in its entirety the adverse judgment which the fragmentary notion had provoked. The only way out of the difficulty is to recombine the scattered elements and assign to each its due proportion. Religion is a life, not merely an assent to set forms of belief; but it is a human life and it therefore involves man's entire being. It needs the guidance of the intellect and the effort of the will. It does not spend itself in feelings nor does it seek to strangle the emotions, but to purify them and make them allies of the reasoning powers. Its center is within the soul, but it radiates through word and work, through the outward forms of worship and the fulfilment of the duties that are owed to God, the fellowman, society and country.

In this view religious education is the imparting of religious truth, but it is something more: it is a training of sense and feeling and will to such purpose that action in conformity with the Divine Law will result. Of necessity it is at once intellectual and moral, ideal and practical. Its truths are sacred and for them it demands reverence; but their sanctity permeates all other knowledge and

their value is great in proportion as they quicken everyday thought and deed, the commonplaces of existence.

Hence it follows that religion should form a part of education from the earliest years. It should be a factor, or rather the chief factor, in the mind's development, not a supplement that is to be added when that development has reached a given stage or when it is, so far as education can make it, a finished process. It doubtless happens at times that a mind which has reached maturity without a thought about religious matters, suddenly sees the light and turns to God: even to the end of life the grace of conversion is possible. But in the ordinary course of events, it is difficult to graft upon the developed mind with its settled modes of thought and action those beliefs and practices which have no germ in the beginning and no function in the subsequent growth.

Among those who realize the need of early religious training, there are many who believe that it can be given in the form of weekly instruction such as the Sunday-school is intended to supply. It is fitting that the knowledge of God and of all that pertains to His service should be received directly from the Church, amid surroundings that are likely to inspire reverence. By this means the child is prepared betimes for the deeper lessons that he will subsequently learn from the pulpit and through his personal study. The Church likewise is free to regulate as seems best for the purpose the content and method of teaching—with no concern about secular knowledge and no interference on the part of the State. Thus the Sunday-school is at once an indispensable adjunct of the Church and a necessary supplement to the instruction given in the everyday school.

As to the utility of the Sunday-school and its vital importance for religion, there can be no question. All the claims usually made for it are valid, and every effort to improve its efficiency deserves commendation. Its success is reassuring to those who favour, and no less to

those who oppose, religious education. For the latter it solves a somewhat tedious problem by clearing the ordinary school of all denominational features and casting upon the Church the responsibility for the spiritual welfare of its members—and of the community at large.

It has sometimes been urged that one or two hours a week is a rather meager allowance for religion as compared with the time that is spent on other subjects. But this disadvantage could easily be removed: let the Church keep its school open seven days in the week or, as the arrangement is in some places, let an hour for religion be added after the daily school period. The time difficulty, however, is not the most serious one, nor will its removal through more frequent religious instruction bring about a final solution so long as that instruction remains outside the regular curriculum. The drawback from which the Sunday-school suffers is not so much its once-a-week schedule as its isolation. Its teaching is literally extraordinary whereas it ought to be the most ordinary, or at least quite as much the regular thing in school as any other sort of instruction. If arithmetic were taught one hour a week, or even five hours but in a separate school where it would have no contact with the rest of the body of knowledge, it would hardly have much effect on the pupil's intellectual growth. Whether it would modify to any appreciable degree his moral development is a question that need not be considered: mathematical knowledge is not generally supposed to be a prime factor in shaping conduct. But this latter result is the essential thing that religious education seeks to accomplish.

The central question connected with the teaching of religion is that of method. The idea that any one with fair intelligence and earnest zeal is qualified for the task, no longer meets general acceptance. But much remains to be done before the teaching of religion will be on a par with the teaching of other subjects. For the latter the utmost has been accomplished in the way of devising

new methods and of putting these on a sound basis. Religion, on the contrary, has not profited very largely by such improvements, certainly not in proportion to its value. Since its truths are held by Christians to be of the greatest importance, one might naturally infer that the methods would receive special attention and that they would be promptly adjusted to the advance in educational principle. Such, however, is not the case. It would rather seem that, once excluded from the school, religion forfeited its right to share the benefits which accrued to other departments of knowledge, and had to content itself with such methods as the individual teacher might evolve from his own experience. The natural consequence is that, in comparison with the results obtained in other departments, religion makes a poor showing. And then it has to bear the reproach of inefficiency which should in justice fall upon the defective methods. So the vicious circle is completed: religion is kept away from general education; it is not taught by proper methods; it fails of its promise to form upright men and women; therefore, it is a superfluous sort of knowledge for which the school has neither time nor place.

Two explanations may be noted here. According to one view, religion has no need of method in the technical sense. Its truths are so appealing that they have only to be presented in order to win acceptance; and the simpler the presentation the deeper is the impression. It is by telling the "story beautiful", or by requiring the pupil to commit the inspired text to memory, or by having him recite the articles of belief that the teacher will get results. The content thus floats over into the learner's mind without the aid of complicated psychological devices and of course without special aptness or training on the part of the teacher.

The other explanation comes from those who hold that religious truth does not permit of the same treatment as that which is applied to secular knowledge. The one is-

sues from the unseen world, declares itself through the voice of authority and demands the assent of faith. The other, originating in fact, experience and commerce with visible things, appeals to reason and challenges criticism. No method, therefore, could be elastic enough to fit both kinds of knowledge; and if, in tentative fashion, the same method were used for both, the result would be detrimental to one of them and even more harmful to the pupil's intelligence.

The two statements have one feature in common; they fail to distinguish between general methods, or the principles on which all methods should rest, and the special procedure that each kind of knowledge requires. In a sense, it is true enough to say that the method of mathematics will not hold good for religion; but neither will it do for history; the difference in content is too great. The efficiency of the school lies not in reducing the special methods to one, but in basing them on the same fundamental principles; and these again are discovered through the study of the mind and of its development.

That religion, because of its simplicity, can dispense with method, is not a self-evident proposition. Christianity contains some doctrines that are easy of apprehension; and it contains others which have occasioned century-long discussion among the world's best thinkers. But even a truth that is simple in itself may require of the teacher the most dextrous handling to bring it within reach of the pupil's intelligence. The process of simplification is not to be confounded with the process of selection or elimination which puts aside the hard sayings and takes only those that are pleasing. To simplify for the purpose of education is to present the truth in such form that it will just suit the learner's capacity at a given stage of development and prepare the way for its representation at each of the succeeding stages. But this is merely another statement of the principle of adaptation which is supposed to underlie all genuine method.

Religion, then, will have its special method, different indeed from other special methods yet not conflicting with them since all are established on the same basis. It will enter the mind not as an occasional visitor but as one who is at home in a structure which the Creator has fashioned. And in the curriculum it will be, for teacher and for pupil, the source of inspiration and the final interpreter of whatever else the mind may acquire.

Is it, however, advisable or profitable for Christianity to make use of methods which come from alien sources? The truths of faith have a spiritual, supernatural character; would not this be impaired if they were treated just as the objects and facts of the material world are treated? Would it not be better, instead of borrowing the principles of modern education, to devise methods that shall accord with the nature of Christian truth and escape the entanglements in which so many pedagogical systems are involved?

The reply may appear strange, but it is nevertheless true that there is no need either of borrowing or of inventing; for the principles of method underlying modern education are essentially those which Christ employed. In the Gospel can be found not a discussion of methods but a very fruitful application of them by One who certainly comprehended the doctrines He taught and who penetrated to their utmost depths the minds of His hearers. Men speak of Christ as the great Teacher, and this is true not only because of His doctrine but also because of the way He delivered it to mankind. And yet few realize how fully the best of modern methods are exemplified and anticipated in His discourse.

The kingdom of heaven is likened not to things rare or remote but to those which occur in daily experience—to the sowing of the seed, the drawing of the nets, the treasure hidden in the field—all objects or events with which His hearers are familiar. Similar use is made of the customs of the people in business, in social life, in

the city and in the country, to inculcate the highest moral and religious truths. The direction is from the known to the unknown, from the material to the spiritual. Christ begins with the figurative and leads on to the literal. At times He adds figure to figure without pausing to explain, and thus evokes a whole group of images as a setting for the idea He seeks to implant. Apperception, interest, imitation—the essentials of method—are illustrated in His teaching. The parables especially embody the most profound psychological and educational principles, *e.g.* the law of association, which serves both to get the doctrine assimilated and to secure its recall whenever the scene of the parable and its homely items recur in later experience. Above all, there is the principle of expression through action inculcated by the daily lessons of perfect living which He gave to His followers.

We have, then, no reason to fear that in adopting the approved methods now so generally employed, the teacher of religion will depart from the spirit of the Master. Nature still suggests to the reflective mind countless analogies with the truths of the Kingdom; and the human world, though far different in many respects from that of twenty centuries ago, abounds with material for parables which only needs, in order to be utilized, the insight of the teacher and meditation on the doctrine.

It thus appears that the children of this world have been wiser in their generation, so far as educational practice is concerned, than those who are the rightful inheritors of Christ's teaching. The former by persistent research and by attentive study of the human mind, have taken over, unwittingly no doubt, but none the less effectually, the methods by which Christianity was first made known; while the Christian teacher too often foregoes the advantage which he more than any one else should appreciate and enjoy.

It was said above that religion should employ the methods that are used for teaching the secular subjects.

But that statement can now be modified, for it is more in accordance with historical sequence to say that religion should follow its own original methods which, as it happens, are those which the school has adopted. Uniformity would be secured without sacrifice on either side and with considerable profit to the side which is of chief importance. And at least one serious objection to making religion a part of education would be removed.

There is one other factor in the teaching of religion which calls for notice in this connection. Besides the pulpit and the Sunday-school, there is the church service. Whether simple or elaborate, the form of worship has an educative power both as a means of suggestion and as a mode of expression. What is seen and heard in the house of God appeals strongly to the child's intelligence and feeling, while his religious sense is strengthened by the part he takes in the sacred function. Much, then, would be gained if Christian worship were conducted on the principles which furnish the methods of education, for in that case Church and school would co-operate effectually towards the child's intellectual and spiritual development.

The liturgy of the Catholic Church has in view the needs of man as a being compounded of body and spirit and so organized that the soul must be reached through the senses. The eye and the ear are the avenues along which religious knowledge must travel, as does every other kind, both good and evil. To say that liturgy is an "appeal to sense" is equivalent to saying that it observes the laws of psychology. And if the sensory impression were the final aim, it would be good psychology to associate religious ideas with the pleasure afforded by colour and sound.

But the stimulation of the senses in the liturgy is only a means towards something higher: its symbolism is what gives it significance. One might say that it is a parable without words. If Christ is called the light of the world by the reader and the preacher, the same thing is brought

home just as plainly by the taper on the altar; and if prayer is "as incense in His sight", the actually perceived odour is but the concrete repetition of the Psalmist's supplication. The spiritual meaning loses nothing when it is supported by sensations and images which accord with it and bring it into consciousness. The senses likewise can be trained as well by impressions that call up the idea of God as by those that arouse interest in nature; and much better surely than by those which sow the seeds of moral corruption.

In the sacramental system, the same principle obtains. The "outward signs of inward grace" were not the only possible means of providing the soul with supernatural assistance, yet Christ instituted them under material forms because of man's nature. Things of the plainest and most familiar sort were selected to serve as vehicles of that which is not only spiritual like the soul itself, but is literally divine since it is God's own action. But if grace is conveyed through forms that appeal to sense and that bear close analogy to the maintenance of organic life, there is no danger of making religion less spiritual by the use of external signs and symbols. Rightly understood, these have a power which may be lacking in eloquent discourse. At Emmaus the disciples who had listened to the Master in the way without recognizing Him, knew Him in the breaking of bread.

"Things, not words" was at a well known period the demand of educational reformers. Though not aware of it, they were insisting on a principle which had for centuries found its application in the liturgy. Somewhat later it was discovered that we "learn by doing". But this again was new only in its adoption by the school. Christ had "begun to do and to teach", His apostles had called for performance and not for profession only, and the Church had given to her worship the character of a *liturgy*, a "public doing" or service. Hence the conspicuous share that action holds in liturgical functions.

Closer acquaintance with these, if only in their psychological aspect, would have led to a much earlier "discovery" of the importance of muscular sensation in the process of development.

To the same effect might be instanced the dramatic instinct which is so marked a feature of childhood and the tendency to imitate which is justly regarded as a potent factor in the growth of the mind and in its training. Both have been utilized for ages by the Church in her adaptation of spiritual truth to the needs and capacities of human nature. It is only in recent times that their meaning for education has received practical recognition. Careful analysis of them has revealed their force and brought about refinements of method which have added considerably to the efficiency of the school, without in the least reducing their value for the purpose of religion.

A fundamental agreement thus appears where, on the surface of things, hopeless estrangement seems to prevail. So much is said about the "separate provinces" of Church and school, and so little about what they have in common, that one might easily regard them as agencies dealing with two different species of being. The admission is sometimes heard that they can and ought to work together for the general weal, but there is always added the proviso that they must avoid the intimate relation which the teaching of religion along with the other subjects would imply. The fact that their methods are essentially the same is overlooked, or at any rate the logical inference is not drawn to any practical effect.

While the psychological features of religion and the community of educational principles are worthy of serious consideration, the ethical needs of the day have probably greater weight with many who are solicitous for the best interests of school and society. The conviction is growing that the curriculum ought to include some sort of moral training, and even the idea that religion is a necessary factor is gaining ground, with an emphasis that is due,

perhaps, to the present world crisis. With efforts at getting a minimum of religious truth as the basis of morality everyone is familiar, though unanimity as to quantity and quality has not yet been reached. How and when the practical outcome shall appear is still matter for speculation, but the issue in any form will undoubtedly affect the constructive aim.

Assuming for the moment that some generally accepted beliefs can be laid together and that on these the framework of morality can be raised, one has then to consider how far Christianity will profit by the result. If, for instance, the impression were given that the moral life can thrive without help from distinctively Christian teaching, would it be an easier task to bring all men together as followers of Christ? Would the observance of only "fundamental" laws bring to consciousness, and to conscience as well, the need of the Gospel and of its specific precepts?

These questions do not imply any disparagement of the purposes to which many earnest people are consecrating their best thought and endeavour. In their view it is better to get some moral training, even of the broad kind, than to have none at all; and they may quite reasonably suggest that when the school has inculcated the basic ideas of religion and morality, the Church should do its share by adding its own special beliefs. And this division of labour would indeed be feasible if the basic ideas were at the same time germinal ideas, if, in other words, they were so selected and communicated that they would, in their unfolding, prepare the mind for the doctrines and the moral precepts which are characteristic of Christianity.

From the Catholic point of view, it is not merely the knowledge of Christ's teaching that counts, but more especially the development of those mental habits of faith and obedience which incline the learner to accept Christian truth in its fulness, and to make it the guide, of daily practice. Belief and conduct being reciprocal, the child's

action in keeping with what is taught at one stage of development, prepares mind and heart for the next stage. With increase of knowledge there goes a strengthening of faith, which in turn elevates and purifies the motives of action. Thereby the purely natural motives and virtues are not neglected: they are rather preserved and lifted to a higher plane of efficiency.

Those who look forward to the triumph of a united Christendom will not be indifferent to the theory that allows religion a share in individual conduct yet provides no place for religious motives in the life of society. That this differentiation is responsible in a measure for the exclusion of religion and morality from education, can be seen by any one who reflects on the present trend of educational policy. A society which no longer draws its principles from the Gospel will hardly demand of the school a specific training in religion; this will be left to the option of each, whether child or adult, and its result will remain at best a private affair.

Christianity, on the other hand, requires that society as a whole, no less than its individual members, shall be permeated by the spirit of the Gospel, that social ideals and sanctions shall foster, instead of blighting, the growth of the spiritual life in each soul. The mission of the school, consequently, is to shape the development of the individual with a view both to his personal growth in virtue and to the discharge of his social obligations. This is the solution which the Church offers for the problem that now confronts the educationist—how to retain what is of value in individualism and yet avoid its narrowness by emphasizing the social element. Neither problem nor solution, however, is new, except in the sense that the neglect of religious training has made it harder to secure in education a basis for social morality. Christianity from the beginning provided the only effectual remedy for the self-centering tendency; and if the Christian spirit had been preserved in education, there would be no

problem to solve beyond that of adapting the genuine altruism of the Gospel to our more complex social conditions.

It may be that the realization of the social importance of the school constitutes the most favourable aspect of the whole situation. At any rate, it is a hopeful symptom, and it can serve as a guide for constructive effort. It means that education is returning, by a circuitous route, to the deepest of all the questions that concern human life and destiny; and it only remains to be seen whether with our advance in knowledge and our psychological research we have gained a deeper insight into man's spiritual needs or a more thorough understanding of his social relations than was shown by Christ and the Church which He founded.

The Controversy Between Saint Paul and Saint James

By Charles Johnston.

Perhaps we may add a more vivid life to the great dispute which reverberates all through the Acts and the Epistles, whether salvation is of Faith or of Works, if we accept the traditional portraits of the chief contestants: Paul, somewhat under middle height, of a fiery spirit, bald above the forehead, his countenance sometimes the face of a man, and sometimes the face of an angel; and James, brother of the Lord, austere, ascetic, the guardian wall of Israel, his knees callous from ceaseless prayer in the temple.

Paul's passionate conviction that by the works of the law no man living might be justified, was the fruit of his own tragical experience. He had tried ardently, desperately, to attain to that salvation: taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, zealous towards God, after the most straitest sect of the religion of Israel he had lived a Pharisee, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. It was the very intensity of his effort, the fervour of his zeal for the law, that led him to do violence against the name of Jesus of Nazareth, shutting up his disciples in prison, and, when they were put to death, giving his voice against them. The fiery denunciation, "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" echoed in the ears of this Pharisee of the Pharisees, until it drove him to the Damascus road, where, on his knees before the vision of the risen Master, he realized the dire failure of the way of the law.

Thereafter Paul, shunning the return to Jerusalem, went into Arabia, and there, perhaps, in the desert, he fought out the great problem in his heart, and returned, calmed and quieted in spirit, to Damascus. For him, salvation lay not in the works of the law, but in a spiritual consciousness, where the fire of devotion kindled the soul until, as white hot iron is welded, it became one with the spirit of the Master, descending from above, so that the disciple gained the mind of Christ; through sharing the death of Christ within his spirit, as Paul did, in his mystical three days' darkness, Christ was once more born in his heart. That fiery aspiration of the soul is faith; the answering benediction of the Master, breathing his life into the heart, is grace. Through such faith and grace there is indeed salvation, not through the deadening works of the law.

The story of James is one of the buried histories of the New Testament. It seems certain that he was one of those who, when Jesus walked in Galilee, because the people of Jerusalem sought to kill him, rather ironically bade him depart and go into Judea, no longer making a secret of his mission and his works. For neither did his brethren believe in him. James was, no doubt, one of those to whom the Master answered: My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet fully come.

This rather ironical hostility, so shortly before the crucifixion: how comes it then that when, three years after the great event on the Damascus road, Paul did at length go up to Jerusalem, to those that were disciples before him, he found, with Peter, and almost the equal of Peter in authority and prestige, that same James, the Lord's brother, who was, very likely, the spokesman of the earlier sarcastic criticism? What had changed the

attitude of James towards his great Elder Brother, turning it from critical enmity to devotion and worship?

The epistle of James sheds no light at all on this; he has none of Paul's gift for inspired autobiography; nor does the narrative of the Acts. We find the sceptical younger brother of him who was crucified, become one of the most fervent of his disciples; as closely associated with Peter and John, in an inner group of disciples, as had been that other James in the old days of the Transfiguration; but we are not told what wrought the change. It is Paul who reveals the secret. It would seem that James, the younger brother, had remained in Jerusalem after the crucifixion, profoundly shocked, we may believe, by the tragedy of it, remembering that he himself had urged Jesus to go up to Jerusalem, to do his works openly there, and that this awful result had followed; also, we may believe, learning from Mother Mary something of her wonderful, heart-broken devotion to the Master. To James, then, as Paul tells us, the Master appeared, before he appeared to Paul, and without doubt to this divine revelation of the Master's power we must attribute the "conversion of Saint James", which must have been hardly less dramatic, less fruitful for the future of the Church, than the conversion of Paul himself. This, then, is the buried history of the brother of the Lord. And from that time, his near relationship to the Master, and the passionate fervour and high moral quality of his own character, in which we may see the image of Mary's holiness, gave him an authority among the disciples which put him on a level, one may say, with the chief of the disciples, Peter and John.

Jesus himself fulfilled all the works of the law, kept all the feasts of the Jews, declared that he had come only to save Israel. The sense of this, and a like devotion to the great historic ritual, inspired James with a passionate devotion to the law, and to the great Temple as being the very embodiment of the law. As, for Ananias and

Tertullus, the new movement was only "the *sect* of the Nazarenes", so James, convinced that salvation was of the Jews, thought of himself and his fellow disciples as strictly orthodox Jews, differing from other Jews only in this, that they recognized Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, but to the end devoutly adhering to the Temple and the Temple worship. For James at this time, it seemed unquestionable that, if a Gentile wished to share the blessing of the Messiah, he must first become a Jew, partaker in the great festivals and rites which commemorated the promises, if he desired to share the hope of Israel. Anything else was, for him, more unthinkable than would have been, ten centuries later, the general salvation of the unbaptized. For James, the rites and festivals of the Temple were the very embodiment of holiness, were holiness itself; and he who would be holy must become a partaker of them.

Meanwhile Paul had been working out his passionate conviction that holiness, salvation, came in no other way but this: a spiritual sharing of the death and rising again of Christ, through faith and grace; that salvation was, therefore, a sharing of the life and consciousness of the risen Lord, a blending of the inner life with his life. To this end he directed all his teaching. It was altogether clear in his thought, during the first missionary journey with Barnabas and his nephew Mark, to Cyprus, the home of Barnabas, and thereafter to the country immediately north of Cyprus, in Asia Minor. It is quite clearly set forth in the great address at Pisidian Antioch, which is the type, not only of all Paul's addresses to Jewish audiences, but of the addresses of the disciples generally,—a rehearsal of the history of Israel, leading up to, and culminating in, the mission of Jesus. The address of Peter is an epitome of it: The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up. The great address of Stephen, which Paul himself heard, is an expan-

sion of it. But neither Peter nor Stephen drew Paul's moral: Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, *from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.*

This address at Pisidian Antioch belongs to about the year 44, some ten years after Paul's conversion, and some seven years before the Council of Jerusalem, at which the whole question of the Gentiles and the Law was to be worked out. At that Council, probably in the year 51, Paul was present as a delegate. Peter, remembering the vision of the great sheet knit at the four corners, boldly declared that the Gentiles might be purified by faith; that they should not be brought under the yoke which the Jews themselves were unable to bear. Then James, the brother of the Lord, summing the matter up almost as chairman of the council, and using the curiously authoritative phrase, My judgment is,—offered a very liberal compromise to the Gentiles, which Paul was authorized to carry to them.

Paul himself then takes up the story: When James, Cephas, and John, he says, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. . . But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the

Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We, who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

It is noteworthy that Paul here puts James before Peter, just as we saw James, not Peter, summing up the decision of the Council of Jerusalem; as if the brother of the Lord dominated the situation at Jerusalem. Paul also accuses Peter, and the other Jewish disciples, of compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews, in spite of the compromise of the Council of Jerusalem; compelling them, that is, to be circumcised, and to keep the festivals and rites of the Jews; to live the life typified by the Temple.

If we are to give Paul's accusation its full force, we must believe that the Council of Jerusalem was followed by a reaction; and that, of this reaction, James, the brother of the Lord, was the leader, while Peter inclined now to one side and now to the other, though he was greatly under the influence of James. The extreme view was, that, in order to be a disciple of Jesus, one must first become a Jew.

Against this narrow view Paul dissented with all the passionate force of his mighty soul, crying: If I build again the things I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for *if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.*

And he vehemently adds: Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law; and sums up the whole contro-

versy in these fiery words: Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. Again he declares: As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised. . . In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.

It is not quite easy to determine the year and the place in which Paul wrote this great autograph letter to the Galatian disciples. But we may approach the matter along the following lines: Some two or three years after the Council of Jerusalem, and therefore about the year 53, Paul set out on his second great missionary journey, at first intending to go over much the same ground as before, to visit and confirm the converts in the inland districts behind his native Cilicia, including Galatia. But he felt the pressure of the Spirit upon him, constraining him to go further to the West, to Troas, where he seems to have been joined by his ardent friend and biographer, the physician Luke, who thereafter shared nearly all his journeys and remained close to him during his imprisonments.

From Troas, Paul sailed to the Macedonian port of Neapolis, and visited the cities of Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia and Thessalonica. From Macedonia he went to Athens, where he spoke, beginning his address, not with the history of Israel, but with the large ideas of Greek philosophy, quoting not the Old Testament, but the hymn to Zeus, composed by Aratus, but coming, as always, to the death and resurrection of the Master. To such a degree was Paul a genuine orator, taking people where he found them, and building on what they already be-

lieved. From Athens Paul went to Corinth, whence he wrote back to the disciples of Thessalonica his first letter to them, the earliest of his letters. In it, there is no echo of the controversy between faith and works; he is concerned rather with the near presence of the Master, and the hope of his coming. In Corinth, Paul remained for a year and a half, and then crossed the Aegean again to Ephesus, making that great and beautiful city his headquarters for the next two or three years. He had definitely plunged into the Hellenic world, and was full of the problems of the Greek converts.

From Ephesus Paul went by sea to Jerusalem, in all likelihood coasting along his own Cilicia, and then south, by Sidon and Tyre, as the journey was made in those days. And he went to the holy city, as he was to go again, two years later, for a purpose which has a deep personal and pathetic interest: to take part in the great Jewish festival, he, the opponent of the Judaizers, the apostle of the uncircumcised; so deep-rooted was his love for the religion into which he had been born, and for its ritual. Like Peter and James and John, he remained an orthodox Jew to the day of his death, even while teaching that by the works of the law no flesh could be justified.

But there was no inconsistency in this. He was concerned, not with those who, like himself, were Jews by birth, but with Greeks or pagans who were converted to Christ; and, concerning these, he held firmly, passionately, that it was wrong and evil to constrain them to become Jews in order that they might be Christians.

From Jerusalem, Paul turned his face again towards Ephesus, but first passed through Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples there. It may well have been at this time that he found, in Galatia, the tendency toward reaction which he had already combated so valiantly at Antioch, withstanding Peter to the face, and accusing him flatly of hypocrisy; the tendency, in a word, to compel converts to be circumcised, and thereafter to

follow the Jewish ritual. This tendency was, as we saw, incarnated in Peter, who, under pressure from the firmer character of James, divided the Antioch disciples in two, those who followed, and those who did not follow, the Jewish ritual. It is possible, though not certain, that this division extended even to the Eucharist, since Paul notes Peter's refusal to eat with non-Jews. So Paul discovered the same teaching making headway in Galatia, and wrote back, probably from Ephesus, to the disciples in Galatia: I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. . . O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? . . . This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?—that is, have you accepted circumcision?

To about the same time belongs the first letter to the Corinthian disciples, also, seemingly, written from Ephesus. There is in it little of the great controversy between Faith and Works, between circumcision and uncircumcision; it breathes rather the spirit of the first compromise made at the Council of Jerusalem, with its simple moral rules for Gentile Christians.

But there is, in this first letter to Corinth, a curious indication, which is, perhaps, of deep significance. In it, Paul speaks several times of Apollos and Cephas, that is, Peter, as, in some sense, his rivals in the work in Corinth: Every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. And again: All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas. Now we know that the Alexandrian Apollos, eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures, had for some time preached in Ephesus, and had then gone to Achaia, that is, to Corinth, bearing letters of introduction to the disciples

there, and doubtless preaching and probably baptizing, there, as he did at Ephesus. Are we, then, to think that the mention of Peter's name together with that of Apollos, means that Peter was with Apollos at Corinth?—that he had followed Paul thither, as he had followed him to Antioch? Was it Peter that Paul had in mind, when he wrote: I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon.

There is nothing very improbable in this. The first epistle of Peter, with its address to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, at least suggests that Peter had visited these five districts of Asia Minor, perhaps in fulfilment of Paul's plan, which was postponed by his direct journey to Greece. If this be so, then, on his way through Asia Minor, Peter may well have carried to Galatia the reactionary tendencies of James, constraining the Greek converts to be circumcised; and, from Asia Minor, it may well be that he passed through Ephesus, which was in the district technically called Asia, and sailed to Corinth. This would account very simply for Paul's mention of him, when writing to the Corinthian disciples.

If this be true, then it may well be Peter that Paul has in mind, when, in the second letter to Corinth, sent forward, apparently, as he was on his way thither through Macedonia, we find him writing: We dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves . . . not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand.—May we see an indication, if not an identification, of those who are in Paul's thoughts, in the words: Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so

am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool), I am more . . . I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind *the very chiefest apostles*. . .

Paul arrived, then, at Corinth, about the year 57 or 58, his heart full of the great question of the circumcision and uncircumcision. He was planning, too, a journey to Rome. So it is entirely natural that, writing forward to the disciples in Rome, during his brief stay in Corinth, he has a great deal to say of Faith and Works, covering the same ground that he has already covered when writing to the Galatians, and using the same arguments, though in extended form. By a brilliant figure, he turns the flank of his opponents, the Judaizing Christians, when, after the opening greetings and precepts, he boldly declares that: He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.—Therefore the spiritual-minded Gentile Christians are the real Jews, heirs of the promise, needing no outward sign or rite. What intense pride in his Jewish birth one finds in this apostle of the uncircumcision. He repeats the same thought in the beautiful parable of the olive tree: And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. . . And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again. For if thou wert cut out of

the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive trees?

Therefore the real Israelites, the true chosen people, are the spiritual-minded Christians, whether circumcised or uncircumcised. What advantage then hath the Jew? Paul asks; or what profit is there in circumcision? He seeks to find the answer in the history of his race, and, in seeking it, he finds justification for his belief that even under the old law, and in the days of the circumcision before the law, salvation was by Faith, not by Works: What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. . . And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God . . . and therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul has already used this very argument in writing to the Galatians: Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness: know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed

with faithful Abraham.—Or, as we might say, whether in the case of Abraham, or of the devoted follower of Christ, it is the condition of the heart and soul that matters, not of the body; salvation rests in spiritual consciousness, raised and enkindled by aspiration until it reaches and blends with the divine consciousness, the mind of Christ.

The same argument concerning Abraham's salvation by faith is to be used once again, in the great unsigned epistle to the Hebrews. If we put aside, for the moment, the question of the authorship of this great Christian document, and consider it with reference to this controversy alone, we shall, I believe, clearly recognize that it has a place in the controversy; that it is one of the briefs on the side of Salvation by Faith; and that, in the whole series of briefs on that side, the epistle to the Hebrews is an extension and amplification of the arguments in the letter to the Romans, just as this is an enlargement of the letter to Galatia, which, in its turn, only expands and emphasizes the sentences quoted from Paul's address at Pisidian Antioch.

Writing to the disciples in Rome, Paul had said, with deep tragic earnestness: Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. We might well take these words as the text of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is a very moving and beautiful appeal to those who love the law and the historic festivals and the high tradition of the Temple at Jerusalem, to see in these things but the promise and earnest of the greater spiritual glory which was to come. Feeling in his own heart the deep love of the devout Jew for these things, the writer of the epistle seeks to capture that love, and transfer it to Christ and the new covenant.

The things of the old law: the Temple, the holy of holies, the sacrifice for the remission of sins, what are these, asks the writer, but the foreshadowings of the Master and of his sacrifice? He is the high priest of the

heavenly temple, a high priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec; of that Melchisedec, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, who was made like unto the Son of God. But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered at once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

The central argument of the epistle ends with the tenth chapter. The eleventh chapter returns once more to the theme which we have seen already expounded to the Galatians and the Romans: that even in the days of the first covenant, nay, from the very beginning of the world, salvation was by faith and not by works. By faith, Abel, Enoch, Noah obtained their spiritual reward. By faith Abraham, when he was called, went out, not knowing whither he went. Through faith also Sarah received strength to conceive, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised. Therefore sprang there of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and of the sand which is by the seashore innumerable.

It is the same extraordinary figure, the birth of sons to Abraham when he himself was as good as dead, which Paul has used in writing to the Romans. It is doubtful if so far-fetched and bizarre a phrase would have occurred independently to two writers. The image is Paul's, the thought is Paul's, the argument of the whole epistle is Paul's, and forms an integral part of the great controversy which he had been carrying on for years. By faith also, not by works, were saved the fathers of Israel, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses. By faith, too, was saved Rahab of Jericho, when she received the spies with peace. By faith were saved Gideon and Barak, Samson and Jephthah, David and Samson, who through faith subdued king-

doms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions.

It is the very culmination of a series of briefs on the side of Faith, a series beginning, so far as our records run, with the great address at Pisidian Antioch. But what of the briefs for the other side, the side of Works? So far, we have known them only through Paul's replies in his epistles. Every passionate and eloquent outburst of his is the answer to arguments, persuasions, proselytizings, stretching from Antioch to Rome, and coming back always to the austere orthodoxy of him who was called the guardian wall of Israel, whose knees were callous from never-ending prayer in the great Temple.

But for once we have the rejoinder, the final brief on the side of Works; and, setting it immediately after the splendid passage of the epistle to the Hebrews, which has just been cited, the fact that it is precisely a rejoinder to that appears indisputable. By *faith*, says the writer to the Hebrews, all were saved, from Abraham to Rahab of Jericho. And in the epistle of James, we find the answer: Was not Abraham our father justified by *works*, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?

As in the almost phantastical argument concerning the son born to Abraham when he was as good as dead, it is hard to believe that Rahab of Jericho could have been twice hit on independently as an argument for the plan of salvation. The feeling that we have here the answer to the splendid outburst in the letter to the Hebrews seems irresistible.

James was put to death, according to the tradition recorded by Josephus, about the year 62 or 63, on the instigation of the Sanhedrin. If this be so, and if our preceding argument be correct, then the epistle of James,

and consequently the epistle to the Hebrews, must have been written before that year, and after the year 57 or 58, in which Paul, writing from Corinth, addressed a simpler form of the same argument to the converts at Rome. But we know that, immediately after he had written to Rome, Paul left Corinth, and, after a brief visit to the coasts of Asia Minor, went to Jerusalem, where he was arrested, to be kept for two years at Caesarea. And we know that, during the few days when he was at liberty in Jerusalem, before he was arrested, he spent much time with James, then the chief personage in the church there. May not the old controversy between them have flamed forth once more in those days before the passover? And may not Paul, in his two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, under the very shadow of Jerusalem, so to speak, have composed this last eloquent appeal, inspired by his heart's desire that Israel should be saved, that Israel should accept the Christ?

Paul's letters fall into two sharply separated groups: the epistles of freedom, and the epistles of bondage. In the former, we see him, full of fiery energy, hurrying hither and thither through the eastern half of the Roman empire, ardently persuading Jew and Greek to turn to the Master. In the second group, the epistles of bondage, he is still at last, his heart only now wanders from land to land, seeking converts. And he who sat manacled, dictating to Philippi, to Colosse, seems never to have lost the sense of his chains. It is Paul the prisoner, Paul in bonds, who is writing, and every epistle of that group echoes the clank of his chains. There is a question as to the reading of the Greek, in the thirty-fourth verse of the tenth chapter of Hebrews, whether we should read, as in the authorized version, "Ye had compassion of me in my bonds", or, with the revised version, "Ye had compassion on them that were in bonds"; but in either case, and in the third verse of the thirteenth chapter, "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them", we have

the very note that is struck in Paul's epistles of bondage.

Yet we need not press the matter. That the letter to the Hebrews is a brief on the side of Faith, in the great controversy, as certainly as the epistle of James is a brief on the side of Works, does not admit of doubt. And to the existence of this controversy, which echoes through the Acts and the Epistles, we owe a boundless debt of gratitude, since it has inspired, through the earnest convictions on both sides, some of the most eloquent and spiritual passages in our New Testament records. What then are we to say of the great controversy itself? Is salvation of Faith or of Works? As is the custom in long controversies, both contestants went very far from the original point of dispute, which was, whether Greek converts should be circumcised. But there was a necessity for this departure, and it is not illogical. For the principle there involved is of universal significance: is it through states of consciousness, or through acts of the will, that the haven of spiritual well-being is reached? Surely the answer, as always in genuine controversy, is neither alternative in its simplicity, but a synthesis of both. Neither one nor the other, neither consciousness without will, nor will without consciousness, makes up spiritual life, but the two together. For if we go deep enough into the depths of our hearts and souls, we shall find that consciousness and will are inseparable; that will is inherent in consciousness; that consciousness is inherent in will; that both are aspects of the one spirit, the immortal.

A Footnote To Buddhism

By Arthur J. Gossip, M.A.,
St. Matthew's United Free Church, Glasgow.

"The man who is entirely ignorant is easily guided: the wise man is still more easily led, but even the Supreme Being himself cannot influence the smatterer", says Bhartrihari, in the Niti Sataka.[1] It is an hard saying for those of us who are impressed by Buddhism, and wistful to get to the heart of it. For, from the nature of the case, few of us in the West can possibly be anything but smatterers as yet, because a large proportion of the vital facts still hang tantalizingly far out of reach. The number of those with the smallest right to an opinion is incredibly small. It is not merely that even a rough history of Buddhism—far more bewildering in its amazing permutations than even Christianity itself—must be a sheer impossibility for several generations yet: that meantime even such a mighty figure as Nagarjuna, *e.g.*, who left a mark on the development of Buddhist thought as deep, perhaps, as that made by, say, Augustine or Luther on our faith, is known to most of us only by a few scattered quotations; that many of the indispensable commentaries are not yet available; that even Buddhaghosa,[2] the Paul of Buddhism, is really only rising above our horizon:—though all these facts are surely staggering enough; but even of the Buddhist bible—a canon, which, in English, would be some four times as large as ours, only a small fraction is translated; and the very Pali texts are not,

[1] Wortham's edition.
[2] "The religion of Ceylon is really the religion of Buddhaghosa."

in every instance, easily procurable.[3] Nor is this wonderful. Rather, when one remembers that it is only a century since some Wesleyan missionaries set foot as the first lonely pioneers in this entirely unknown field, almost a generation before anybody else;[4] and only forty years since that extraordinary scholar, Childers, issued the Pali Dictionary, a work of 20,000 words—he, single-handed, journeying in an untrodden path—it is surely with a wondering admiration that one regards the little knot of scholars who have, since then, already blazed a trail for us, so far and so efficiently, into the rank jungle of our ignorance; who with tremendous toil and courage are steadily unearthing for us what, within limits, is one of the richest veins of human thought; and who will yet be held in a grateful remembrance, comparable to that we all feel for those other students of the fourteenth century who, with like daring, rediscovered Greek, and led the West into that wide and fair domain of thought and philosophy. But their work is of necessity as yet most incomplete and even fragmentary.

And there are other difficulties. For one thing, Buddhist psychology lies, of course, at the base of Buddhist thought and teaching: and that psychology is sufficiently daunting.[5] The whole mind and experience of man has been mapped out with phenomenal care: each varying mood, in every fluctuation of it, is marked and named as certainly as every knoll and hollow on a mountainside are entered on an ordnance survey chart.[6] There are *e.g.* it seems eighty-nine different types of consciousness: or, when one speaks to more than mere beginners, really 121 of them, and in the simplest act of thought no less than nineteen mental properties. Here obviously is a

[3] Up to 1880 not even one entire text had been translated.

[4] Rev. B. Clough's *Pali Grammar*, 1824.

[5] Cf. the standard work, *The Compendium of Philosophy*, now translated for the Pali Text Society.

[6] The word for *Joy in Others' Joy*, which Butler so desired, is quite common in Pali.

region in which few can walk with assurance and ease! And yet all this is woven into the very warp and woof of Buddhism. For all Buddhist philosophy is essentially practical, is interesting to them, and is undertaken by them, only as a means to moral ends. Thought is thus delicately dissected, solely as a help towards cleansing thought: and their philosophy is in no sense an abstract thing. It is an highroad, cut with infinite patience, to be travelled on, and by which men can reach the mountain-tops, so hard to scale; and so live high above the fogs and mists. They are philosophers in order to live out their ethics. And without such an understanding of their psychology as few of us possess we are as good as certain to be often far astray all through. And indeed on almost every page of their scriptures one stumbles against something to remind one that the Eastern—and in particular, the Buddhist mind—works differently from ours, is built up on other lines, speaks a different mental language, thinks with a different accent, is the heir and product of a long philosophy in which we have no share, is untouched by the schools and modes of thought which have gradually worn the channels in our Western brains, through and along which our thinking naturally finds its course and outlet. Fundamental principles and basal conceptions,—the soul, a continuous personality, the reality of matter, and the like, in our sense of the terms, which are our very postulates, are alien to them; while they on their side assume no less confidently things difficult and strange to us. Till for a little one has the dazed feeling of a person, wakened by an earthquake, who looks out on the accustomed scene, to find all the familiar landmarks gone.[7]

Nor are we always helped by Buddha's method, which certainly does not make for a formal consistency. It was

[7] Often things are just reversed. We can think easily of a world without *end*, but it must have a beginning: with the Buddhist, it is the opposite.

his kindly habit in interviews always to put himself as far as possible in the other's place: to begin with large concessions. When two good souls differed as to the means of accomplishing union with God, and referred their dispute to him—one of several little touches that betoken that Buddha's views on God were not so certainly, or at least so straitly, what they have been assumed to be—he admits the excellence of such a union, and proceeds to show that it can not be had by any other method than by growing into likeness to God's character; which he defines as freedom from all anger and malice evil and selfishness; and as a boundless love and sympathy and joy in others' joy! Strange words, surely, from this "agnostic", even "atheist"! But parallel columns could readily enough be made on many fundamental points where Buddha seems, at least, to contradict himself; and to take different sides: with the result that, as Luther founded upon certain Pauline passages, and his opponents, largely upon James, so different Buddhist sects, basing themselves on different sayings of the Buddha, have arrived at singularly diverse goals.[8]

All which, and much more, demands diffidence in us. Montefiore has an arresting saying that the true account of any religion can never be written, because those who hold it are unconsciously prejudiced in its favour, while those outside simply cannot know just what gives it its power. Which probably is true even in the most favourable circumstances: and where the adherents of a system differ as fundamentally from one another as Buddhists do, then those outside ought to walk warily, and to speak very humbly.

Two things are always necessary for some real understanding of a movement—some knowledge of the man who

[8] The great division between the Mahayana and the Hinayana on almost every fundamental matter: yet both account themselves orthodox Buddhists. There are Buddhist sects today which have evolved a religion curiously like Christianity with the whole stress laid on grace.

spoke;—for in the last resort it is always a personal thing: and some insight into the time to which his message was primarily addressed, and of the faults of which it was offered, in the first instance, as a corrective. The Gospels are the Gospels because Christ is Christ: and whenever and wherever He had lived He would have uttered the great and eternal truths of religion in their final and perfect form; but it is inconceivable that had our Lord been born, not in Judaea, nineteen centuries ago, but, say, in a London East-end slum today, the form and setting of His message would have been in all points what they are. And Buddhism is Buddhism, because Buddha was Buddha, and because the mental and moral and religious movements of his time were what they were. For, daring and original genius though he was, he was no Melchizedek, without father or mother. He too had forerunners.[9] He too was borne along in no small measure on the tides of the popular thought movements of his day, as in our generation we all speak unconsciously in terms of evolution. Much, very much, in his system, even central fundamental matters, are not distinctively Buddhistic at all, but are simply the assimilation and continuance of features of the general beliefs and current practices: as in the Old Testament there is a distinct stratum which is not peculiarly Jewish in the least, but Babylonian; a deposit brought down by the river of the Jewish national life from the hills where it first rose. And, on the other hand, the original elements in Buddhism are not abstract speculations in a vacuum, but are flung out as a challenge and a criticism and a corrective, full in the face of very definite errors and very obvious failures and very popular creeds then actually much in vogue.

As to the man, of all the endless generations, few can be better known to us than he. True, there is no formal biography of him until quite late; and yet continual slight

[9] In some ways. Yajuavalkya, perhaps: in some ways what grew to be the Sankhya philosophy.

touches in the *Suttas* make very real and very vivid to us one of the most gracious and winsome and kindly of all characters in history, curiously hopeful over hopeless enough people, and wonderfully patient with dull minds. Confucius once remarked that if, when he had shown one corner of a subject, the pupil could not see the others, himself, he had small place for him; he could not always be repeating the same things. That was not Buddha's way, who took his disappointments quietly and patiently, almost pathetically so, till it is very wistfully that we look at this fellowman of ours, so clean in life, so unselfish in heart, so sane in mind—did he not often pick his way right shrewdly between the extremes of things and of opinions, long before Aristotle's day? Did he not utterly refuse to lay down formulae rigidly uniform that dealt with mankind as a mass and did not recognize the differences between temperaments[10]—so tolerant, so masterly in self-control, so wise, so big; and all these things are clearly visible in many ways in the great system that his mind thought out. But the centre of his nature was a great compassion. The sorrows and sufferings of men, the mystery and pathos of this life of ours, so haunted by dread things, came home acutely to him, and kept tugging at his heart. And it was out of that real Buddhism arose.

That subtle scholar, A. B. Davidson, was a reserved, shy Scottish soul: and yet—"Do you ever", he once asked, "without any special reason for grief, fall into an uncontrollable weeping?" Then after a pause, he added, "Just the other day that came upon me in great strength. I was alone: and there came such a sense of the mystery, the uncertainty, the loneliness, the pathos of life, that I for a long time was shaken with sobs, which I was unable to control." Nor was this an isolated experience. "When I look out on the world", he said, "it is not the

[10] Because of this, and of the mildness of Buddhist asceticism, Devadetta's schism arose.

sin that strikes me first, it is the mass of suffering." And on these occasions of inward explosion and upheaval the tears sprang from the cruel generalization upon life of those too penetrating eyes—"that young men waste their years in trying to know what to do: and old men in going back to youth to replenish from its fountains the sinking cistern of their age", "that the world has never got their best even from the greatest of its children, that fate is envious, and life a defeated joy, and the whole creation in pain—*sunt lachrymae rerum*".[11]

And it was because, so long ago in India, there arose another mind like that, that Buddhism was born.

To us, one of the most real factors of our melancholy is the evanescence of all human things. We read the old Chinese poetry—well on, some of it, to some three thousand years in age—and yet the most modern of all literature! For it is all as vivid as if it happened yesterday! And the girl who waited for her lover, with her pulses beating fast; and the lad who sped to her, with his heart singing all the way; and all these men and women who so longed and grieved and hoped and toiled and loved,—these hot and eager human hearts, have been crumbled into a little dust, how long! And we too shall soon pass, be covered quickly out of sight within a shallow grave, we and our dreams and hopes and fears: and the great aeons will sweep on, and the unending generations hurry past; and we shall be out of it all, forgotten as though we had never been.

But to Buddha, reared in that other thought of transmigration, so common even then in India, it was the fearsome permanence of it all, as we would say, that daunted him and smote him in the face. Empires would pass, and be remembered only as a dim memory of the "once upon a time": the rivers would wear down the solid hills, but these unhappy folk would be still held fast in the prisonhouse of life, would be still losing little ones, still

[11] Taylor Innes, Intro., *The Call of God*, pp. 44–5.

bearing pain and sorrow, still growing old and lonely. Far worse than that indeed, for a man's karma only very, very rarely sets him as high as a human life, still less in any of the intricate cosmogony of heavens; for the most part, condemns him to be a peta, one of those most miserable beings whose whole existence, in the case of some of them, is a hunger that can never be appeased: or else, over and over and over again, to a dire all but infinity, in one or other of the many grim and fearsome purgatories.[12] And even if he be lifted up to heaven, still, when the karma of the good deeds that brought him there has been exhausted and fulfilled, he will be cast down again, perhaps to the very lowest depths of all, there to expiate through dreary aeons the folly of some old, old sin.[13] So up and down and round and round, unendingly, are men swept on the wheel of being; and only rarely do they reach the sunshine and a human life: and every one we meet has often been in purgatory for huge ages; and yet oftener, likely, will be there again.

The thought of that lay like a cold hand upon Buddha's heart. Was there no way to save them from it all? Like Davidson, what he saw first was not the world's sin, but its mass of suffering. Others of course were feeling the pressure of it all; and were offering their solutions. Through the thick mists of the long centuries that lie between us and those far-off days the figures of once influential teachers loom up dimly. And, for the most part, they are men stunned and disheartened; struggling desperately against this net of transmigration in which men lay caught fast—their teaching all lopsided and quite often half immoral, in the fierceness of their recoil from that, and the tremendous and eternal truths that are at least embedded in it.

The Brahmans, indeed, held, of course, that as the

[12] The descriptions of these are Dantesque in horror: but, though one may remain there aeons upon aeons, they are purgatories, not hells.

[13] And this is true even of Brahma himself.

brawling and wild tumult of a mountain burn finds rest at last within the stillness of the summer sea, so these hot, fevered, fretful hearts of ours can gather home into the calm and quiet of the All, of which they form a portion —a little pool left high up on the sandy shore, yet part of the great sea. But much as he admired and reverenced the best among the Brahmans, Buddha's criticism was that they could point to no one who had actually managed to live out their claim. And there were other somewhat sinister figures in the field:—Agita, cutting the Gordian knot with his doctrine of annihilation; Purana, roundly declaring that there is no retribution, and that good and evil both have the same end; perhaps meaning thereby no more than what the saints of the Old Testament believed, that after death all men, without moral distinction, are herded into the one vague, bleached, dusty, dreadful shadow of a world:—but almost certainly something more radical than that by far: and others not a few:[14] notably Makkhali whom, judging from the quite unusual heat with which Buddha occasionally spoke of him, he held to be far the most dangerous teacher of his day. "I do not see anyone so hurtful and pernicious, so harmful and displeasing to gods and men, as the empty-headed Makkhali." His was an open theory of mere blind chance, and of hopeless despair. "There is no cause either proximate or remote for the rectitude of beings: they become pure without reason and without cause." "They are bent this way and that by their fate, by their conditions, by their individual nature." "The attainment of any given condition does not depend either on one's own acts, or the acts of another, or on human efforts."[15]

Such were some of the popular theories of his day: but Buddha would have none of them, and that because they undermined one's efforts after purity: and so struck

[14] The founder of the Jains, *e.g.*

[15] *Sutta Sumana Phala*, Rhys David's translation.

out upon a path as daring and original as man's feet ever travelled: boldly repudiated, as we shall see, the traditional form of transmigration; yet held to it, no one more stoutly in all history, that at the back and at the heart of things are moral laws that can not be evaded: that there is an eternal difference between right and wrong, and that it matters infinitely which of them we choose: that, karma or no karma, we can choose and do choose, that it is foolishness for any man to whimper, because any misery in which he is involved is the result of his own blinded mind and wayward wishes, and that the one hope is to cease to look outside ourselves for somebody to blame, to see that happiness is either lost or won within one's own will. In a fine passage in the *Anguttara*[16] he lays it down that irrational views and slackness in moral effort spring from three misconceptions—the thought that our present condition has been fixed and settled by our former lives: or, by a divine creation and decree that overrides all our poor human efforts: or, by mere chance. It is not true, he cries. If anybody is a murderer or a thief, then he is that only because he himself has willed to be it, for he need not be it, can refuse to be it. And if he is that, then the whole responsibility rests, in the last resort, only on him, and can't be shuffled off on anything or anybody else. That was one of the most fundamental rocks upon which Buddha took his stand over against the fatalism common in his day. There is nothing more central in his system than his deep and dark and difficult "wheel of causation". Yet its main points seem wholly clear. Step by step, he remorselessly traces back all human misery by twelve successive stages to its fountainhead in ignorance. That is the source of all unhappiness; not fate, nor any of the other excuses we put forward, but our own failure to realize things as they really are. And that wellhead from which the bitter waters flow broad across all the earth

[16] *Anguttara Mahavaga*, III, 61.

can be dried up: and, that done, misery will cease.[17] Don't blame life and being for your miseries, blame yourself and right yourself, and they will cease; they, and ultimately life and being too. For Buddha never dreamed of questioning that Indian axiom that life is essentially evil: that it is better not to be than to be even at the best. The "four noble truths" from which he starts lay that down quite explicitly—four truths taken from the contemporary medical textbooks, and applied by him to suffering as a whole—there is the disease of suffering: there is a cause for the disease: there is the removal of the cause: and there is the way that leads to the removal and so to salvation, which is health. And that third is the supression of the thirst for life, and its attendant ills: while the fourth, how to do that, is just Buddhism at its most original and essential. We are all here penned in this prisonhouse of a practically endless life, and life means suffering: what then are we to do for one another and ourselves? That was Buddha's problem: those the axioms from which he starts. And what he does, I think, is practically to lay down two daring propositions full in the teeth of all the inherited knowledge of the ages. First, that existence, though essentially an evil, can be made much less evil, can indeed be filled with peace and happiness: that here, that now. And second, that if anyone desires to leave it,—and he assumes that all wise folk will—that can be done; the road is plain, the door is open, there is nothing that can hinder anyone from reaching the supposed impossible goal, except oneself. And that road he has come to show.

First, then, that bold declaration that life, if one uses it right, can be made to spell peace and "coolness": and not that alone, but something far more positive—a conscious gladness against which all the ills, of which others complain, hurtle harmlessly, leaving it unpierced.

[17] According to another very common diagnosis, there are three springs of evil—greed, ill-will, and dulness.

A FOOTNOTE TO BUDDHISM

The usual talk about Buddhism as if it were a kind of pale monastic twilight, into which poor souls shut themselves and shiver: a pinched, bare, niggardly existence, something much less than the full sunshine that God made for us and means us to enjoy, is an exact reversal of the truth. Buddhism came to India as when on a gray day of mist and drizzle and low, louring clouds, the sun breaks through and the blue sky appears, and the dull atmosphere grows golden. Very noticeable in its system is the place that it gives joy. That may not be the greatest thing of all, in fact, it certainly is not; for there is something deeper and fuller than the deepest joy. And yet one can not reach Nirvana unless joy too is a characteristic: joy is set down explicitly as one of the seven constituents of that insight that alone leads on to Arahatship: and in so many and set terms Buddha himself declares that it is simply inconceivable that anyone can really have made any progress in the eightfold path, yet remain sad. Such was the theory, and it worked out. It was offered as a gospel, as "a message of grace to all": and it proved good news indeed that made all life another thing through the sheer gladness that it brought. Read the *Psalms of the Sisters*, *e.g.*,—what these typical Buddhist saints set down as their actual experiences of what their faith had done for them and in them. They are all full of wondering gratitude. Sometimes it is the "coolness" that has taken the place of the hot fever that formerly burned in their hearts that sets them singing—for they all sing—sometimes it is the sense of freedom in place of the old stifled life: quite frequently it is simply the pure gladness of it all. For one thing, not all Buddhists indeed, not even all Buddhist monks, but absolutely every Buddhist saint, has the grace of assurance, as we would say: knows that he will never fall away. Once one has become a Sotapanno, has become "converted" in our phrase, "has entered on the stream", as they express it, has begun to climb "the paths" that lead to Nirvana, there is no possibility

of slipping back. According to one's zeal and success one may have to return once or twice, or—seven times at most—but one is fairly within sight of salvation; and that because one is steadily gaining the character which is salvation. All which means "bliss". Yet men go on repeating the old shibboleth about Buddhism being a narcotic, and a kind of opiate that dulls the pain of weary-hearted Asia into a merciful passivity! What it actually did was to make life far brighter coloured and more vivid. Certainly the ideal is something akin to what we call the peace of God: or better perhaps, that equanimity on which the Roman Catholic writers lay such stress[18]—a spirit tamed and quiet, done with fretting and with fluster; too sure to fear, too strong to grow flurried, that knows the story's end, and so has no need to be swept into disquietude by any incident in the evolving of the plot. Yet there is nothing Stoic in it, and desire is neither maimed nor killed, but only purified and set on higher things. Even with its monasticism it is a fair thing to say that it is a full, rich, eager life to which it led, and leads.[19]

Buddhism *e.g.* had its woman's movement all these centuries ago: its famous women scholars, its distinguished women preachers and evangelists and missionaries and debaters, and the like.[20] Think what a world of difference there lies between all that and the dull round of other women's tame existence then! Yet that is hardly an exaggeration of the new interest and zest and taste it gave to every real Buddhist's life.[21]

And how was it to be obtained, this happiness? Buddha agrees with Aristotle: it is the bloom, say both of them, that lies upon a life of goodness. And not they

[18] Cf. *e.g.*, the *Dhaniya Sutta* in the *Sutta Nipata*, for this in a plain herdsman.

[19] But even then its monasticism was felt by many to mean impoverishment, and surely rightly.

[20] Most famous of the Buddhist women, perhaps, is Patacava, one of the immortal Seven Sisters, as they were called.

[21] Cf. *e.g.* the chapter on Happiness in the *Dhammapada*, with its reiterated "We live happily indeed."

only, of course. Far from that. Our Lord Himself says the same thing. This happiness, He tells us, which you are all seeking, can be gained only in one possible way, and lays that down, broad and plain, but very high, before our feet in the Beatitudes. And Buddha too has his beatitudes,[22] and singularly beautiful they are. Like Augustine he watched the rush and hubbub of the busy, eager world with a sad smile upon his lips: told men they were still children in spite of their years, still playing the old childish games, with different counters now, no doubt —gold and the like instead of bricks and toys—but still essentially the same. For then, too, the vast mass of folk were utterly unthinking: then too the world was just as fascinating as it is today; then too people lived often in open defiance of their creeds; and though they knew of the long future, and that their destiny depended on the use that they made of the now, allowed the present to absorb their energies and thoughts, and lived as if they were ephemerids, chancing that long to come. And happiness, says Buddha, can't be won that way. No: the mind must be tamed, and the heart cleansed, and the desires uplifted, and the doors of the senses guarded jealously. Self-mastery must be won; as we would say, we must gain holiness.

And, as the first step to that, one must refuse all the cheap, easy, popular substitutes for that, as nothing to the point, mere snares that trick one into the belief that one is making progress, while the life is really being left unlived, the needed character unwon. And, first among these, Buddha sets down speculation: metaphysics and theology, as we would say. His was an age of immense mental activity: and as there was small science then, all the powers of that acutely minded people were not dissipated over a score of interests as men's are now, but concentrated practically wholly on the questions that lie on the borderland of religion and philosophy. There

[22] *Mahamangalasutta.*

were *e.g.* no less than sixty-eight clamorous sects, each hot upon the propagation of their own particular creed as to the end and the beginning of the world, and such like themes, held to be all important. And Buddha brusquely brushed the whole thing out of court as nothing to the point and a sheer waste of precious time, each second of which is required for the real end in hand. There are ten subjects called "the indeterminates"—whether the soul is different or not from the body, whether the world is eternal or no, and infinite or not, whether one who attains to the full truth has an existence after death, or passes out of being—upon which he often spoke—indeed, not always consistently, but on which he refused to give any set opinion: and that on the grounds, first that we have no evidence; and second and still more important, that such things have nothing to do with our business—with the gaining of a holy life. And there are many other matters similarly banned. Buddha has his own story of how the world rose into being; and a strange tale it is,[23] but evidently he himself laid no particular stress on it: dismissed all speculations on that matter with contempt, bracketing it with "street gossip" and "old wives' tales", and other kinds of "frivolous talk". Buddhism has a whole series of heavens, and much detailed description of them: yet when certain people asked him whether there is a heaven or no—What matter just now? he replied: enough for you to know that if there is, no one who is not holy will ever reach it: and if there is not, well, we shall have the happiness of being holy here. Why bother then about impertinent problems which don't touch the issue? You get to your task!

Even about such a central matter as Nirvana he took the same line. Is it, they asked him, an existence, this Nirvana, or is it not? And he replied that whatever it is, those who spend their time asking such silly questions, contending that it is or is not an existence, prove nothing

[23] See Warren's *Translations in Buddhism.*

except this, that neither one nor other of them has any share in it.[24] I am come to give a medicine to men, he said, and am not to be drawn away to chatter about mere subsidiary things. Your business is to gain the character that I have set before you. You have no time for speculations or disputes: there is no need for them: for nobody, so he maintains in many a page of the *Sutta Nipata*, *e.g.*, is made any purer by these things: and all too often lapses into heat and bigotry and fatal flaws like these, or else into the vain imagination that the holding of a correct creed is in itself sufficient. In short, Buddha's position seems to have been that there is a whole region in which we simply cannot know: where the best we can do is to adopt certain working theories, doctrines thrown out in the direction of the facts. And to give oneself to the theories, and neglect the working, is to miss the whole point of the thing. "Lord, are there few that be saved?" "Strive thou", said Christ. That is exactly Buddha's point of view on many things. And while no one with any reverence in his nature can regard the great Christian symbols and theologies with anything but veneration—for does not every phrase of them represent an incredible mass of intellectual labour and the long agony of generations of strained souls?—still when one looks abroad over the city slums and half an earth at war, surely the thought will rise, which came to Buddha, that surely if all the care and thought and pains and learning, all the patience and the assiduity that have been swallowed up in the mere defining of religion had been given to the actual working of it out, things would have been far better and much further on. "For the heresy of all heresies", says William Law, "is a worldly spirit."

Similarly, Buddha, looking out on the religiosity coupled to the low moral tone around him, practically ignored all worship as a proved and pernicious snare, that obviously deceives people into fancying that their attend-

[24] Poussin's quotations from the *Majjhinia*, etc.

ance at that will be taken for the clean life, and the pure heart.[25] And all the prophets are agreed that it is strangely difficult for men not to mistake the scaffolding for the building: and the mere means for the end. While the small place that God holds in his system is probably due to his feeling that the folk about him were depending on God's favour or grace or pity or indulgence to atone for them and pull them through; and so were slacker in their endeavours after holiness. And is it not ghastily true that, as Bunyan saw, there *are* poor souls who are lulled to sleep under and by the very Cross; who are less eager to avoid sin, because they know God is long-suffering, than they would be, did they believe that He is strictly just and even merciless? And so he ruled God out as being, not a help, rather a curse to men.

None the less, in all this Buddha seems unlike himself; and to lapse from his usual balance. He prided himself, and justly, that his was the "middle path", avoiding both worldliness and undue asceticism: running between all the extremes of things indeed, taking the good from either hand, while avoiding the overemphasis and evil. But of all that there is little evidence here. I shall take no strong drink because certain folk have abused it, declare we teetotalers, which may, or may not, be logical. But to abstain from worship and from God, because certain people have abused that and His grace, is not a "middle" way, to say the least. No doubt the fact that "right views" is the first step in the eightfold path proves quite conclusively that Buddha had a very real place for philosophy and metaphysics, so long as these were practical and told upon the living of the life: no doubt the ceremonies on the Uposatha[26] and the like, show that he

[25] This idea is one of the "fetters to be snapt".

[26] The Buddhist Sabbath. Much more might be added. The Buddhist teaching on fasting is extraordinarily sane and wise, their practice of confession, beautifully simple and humble and true, and always reciprocal: two monks confess each to the other in utter friendship.

tried to find a substitute for worship. But to rule out God because some men misunderstand Him and misuse His grace is petulant, and unlike Buddha's usual sanity. "Do all the monks join from these high motives?" Melinda asked of Nagasena. "By no means", he most honestly replied. "Some do so to escape from the tyranny of kings, like you: and some, one fears, merely to evade their debts." Yet the order was not abolished because some rogues so abused it; but disciplinary measures were laid down for such.

But Buddhism is much more than a criticism: it rises, for one thing, into a positive morality so exquisite that its beauty has become proverbial. There are indeed two strata: one the higher, the eightfold path, upon which many Buddhists never enter; and another, lower one, for ordinary people—the Silas, the five universal commandments, and much else—for which the teacher himself claimed no manner of originality whatever. And in truth there is really small chance of originality in ethics! In the maxims of Ptah-hotep, the oldest extant book in the world, written in Egypt some six thousand years ago, one finds in that father's directions for his son much the same standard set as is still set us now—love, kindness, free forgiveness, taking the first step to end a quarrel even where one is right, and so on—the familiar rules, so hard to put in practice. Buddha indeed believed quite definitely in a kind of inner light. He held, of course, that his own teaching was of the uttermost importance to the world. But face to face with an actual decision to be made, with a choice to be taken between two views of what one's conduct ought to be, every one, he says, knows perfectly well within himself what is the proper course for him; and requires no logic nor teacher, nor sacred book to lay it down for him, must indeed reject all these if they clash with that knowledge within. That there should be two strata seems surprising, and yet it is not for us to jeer at that. For, after all, what is

the famous vow of Santa Teresa before which all the Romanist saints stand dazed and breathless at the sheer audacity and intrepidity of it? "I have made a vow never to offend God again in the least matter. I have vowed that I would rather die a thousand deaths than do anything of the kind, knowing that I was doing it. I am resolved never to leave anything undone that I consider still more perfect and for the honour of our Lord." Which surely is what all of us ought to be doing. But the fact is that, while our Lord has a most honouring belief in us, claims and expects the very most from all of us, we practically have adopted for our standard something we know to be far lower than the complete Christian teaching, and leave the fulness of that to some few adventurous saints.

Yet, whether lower or higher, Buddhist morality is an impressive structure; and has a certain very real originality by reason of what it selects, and what it lets alone, and where it lays its emphasis. It is not easy *e.g.* to discover so high a standard as this from the *Meta sutta*: "As a mother at the risk of her life watches over her own child, her only child, so also let every one cultivate a boundlessly friendly mind towards all beings. And let him cultivate good will towards all the world, without hatred, without enmity. Standing, walking, sitting, lying down, let him devote himself to this mind. People then say, here indeed is the ideal life." Or, take the *Brahma Viharas*. Buddhism has no prayer: but it seeks to provide a kind of substitute at least for intercession and for recollection. One is enjoined to sit down and perform these four great meditations: to pervade the whole world, passing by no living thing, with a heart full of immeasurable love, like God's:[27] and then with a like sympathy that enters into every sufferer's sufferings, making them one's own; and a like joy in other's joys; and lastly with an equanimity that learns to brace itself

[27] This is the true way to union with Brahma, Buddha says.

to face the worst life has to give,—and all to the exclusion of all selfishness, and so that these various feelings may grow to become one's settled moods.

For, like all the sages, Buddha really traces back all evil in the last resort to selfishness. In his impressive story of the fall it is when men begin to hoard things for themselves that all the evils break loose like a flood. And that lesson is continually taught, alike in the *Jatakas*, those quaint folk tales, and in the deepest and the darkest Buddhistic philosophy. For Buddha came to the conclusion that there is no way of eradicating selfishness but by abolishing the self; and so boldly taught that there is no self, no soul, and no continuous personality at all. Nobody lives on after death in our sense of that term: and that is little, for there is no I and no You ever—only a river of successive states, with no underlying unifying connecting substratum like a soul. In short, Buddha antedated Heracleitus's teaching. πάντα ῥέι, he also says: that is indeed the centre of his whole philosophy. There is no being: there is only a continuous becoming. And in some ways at least we are beginning to agree with him. This solid earth of ours looks like a thing that is. And yet in reality it is in constant flux and transformation: the hills are melting like the shadows passing over them: new continents are forming underneath the sea; not for two seconds is the earth the same; it is only a vast, continuous becoming, after all. Perhaps we can understand Buddhism better in some ways now that we have left behind us our old gross and static conceptions of matter. Bergson in this is only a throwback to very early thought. For Buddha laid down long ago that matter, insofar as it exists at all, is an elusive, subtle, mobile, fluid kind of thing, that endures at a maximum for only seventeen thought moments. And mind and personality are even less permanent. Hume declared that when he tried to catch himself he always "stumbled on a particular perception". Inevitably, so

says Buddha, because there isn't anything else there. What we call the ego is a fiction. To take their two favorite metaphors—a river is composed of its successive waves, and apart from the waves there is no river: or, a chariot is not something underlying, added to its various constituent parts, it is the parts; that only, nothing more. And we are merely a river of individually transient states of consciousness, the aggregates of which we are composed are as a mass of foam, constantly forming and melting on the waters; or, as milk grows curds, and curds turn to butter, and butter becomes ghee, and ghee junket, so, what you are now is not what was here last second; although there is some real connection,—there is no I. Here again is an instance (the most daring of them all) of an attempt to steer a "middle path" between the extremes of error.[28] Treat men as ephemerids, so Buddha argued, and their moral tone is lowered. Teach them that they are immortal, and they postpone what they must set about at once to some of the many lives before them. What is required, if men are to grow holy, is a type of survival, personal enough to prove that no one can evade the moral laws and their tremendous consequences, and yet impersonal enough to make men see that now is the accepted time, and their one chance of salvation. And hence Buddha excogitated his strange views of transmigration—*I* do not survive, but my character does. Influence is immortal. Every deed, and word, and thought (and Buddhism is singularly impressive in the immense importance it lays upon thought)

[28] That to cling to personality is the heresy of all heresies, and the ignorance from which suffering flows, is clear. But the very emphasis with which denial of this doctrine is condemned in the *Xatha Vatthu*, etc. is itself proof that heresy on this question has always been a real and present fact. And certainly these "personalists" had and have not a little in the scriptures on which to found. For the Buddha himself admitted that he spoke in both senses; but only, so he said, because he was not deceived by words. There are dozens of places, *e.g.* where we are told where certain individuals now are after their death—in the Paduna "hell" perhaps, or in one of the heavens, or reborn on earth.

must normally[29] bear its inevitable fruit. But whereas we think of our influence as percolating over a wide surface, and acting through many future beings, the Buddhist rather pictures it as concentrated into one new personality which is called into existence by my karma—I, yet not I at all. According to this reading, Buddhism is an essentially unselfish scheme. I strain and strive for holiness only for the pleasure that it gives me here, not for a heaven or a future bliss, for at death I go out; there is no I, indeed, at all: and my passion for Nirvana is not to attain any personal gain, but for the sake of that unhappy one, as we would say, whom my karma calls into being, and who bears my burden, and then, in turn, hands suffering on to others still to come.

But I can cause my karma to cease, and so break the agelong chain of beings for whom I am responsible. And how? By attaining to that perfect holiness which, as we have seen, is alone perfect happiness: by treading the eightfold path that leads to Nirvana, and perfection in which *is* Nirvana. Here again, indeed, Buddha speaks of two methods, one ampler and much more elaborated than the other, open only to brethren and sisters of the order, and usually quicker in result, by reason of the many disciplines and exercises they can practice, very few of which are peculiarly Buddhistic, but upon which emphatic stress is laid as likely greatly to accelerate one's pace—disciplines which lead us up a track steep and unfamiliar to our Western minds, into a rarified atmosphere of mystic and psychic facts, trances and meditations, and strange powers and insights, altogether alien to the experience and point of view of most of us. Enough, perhaps, to say that those who grow impatient should remember what is taught over and over and over again, that all these things are impossible without moral purity,

[29] There are three kinds of karma: (a) to be experienced in this life; (b) in the next life; (c) in any future life. (a) and (b) sometimes have no favourable opportunity, and never take shape; become ineffectual (*ahosika*).

are never substituted in the place of moral purity (that is laid down as an appalling snare), and are used only as a help towards further purity. While such a passage as this from Tennyson's Life, in which he describes "a waking trance" he often had—"this has generally come upon me through repeating my own name silently to myself two or three times, till all at once, as it were out of the intensity of the consciousness of the individuality, the individuality seemed to dissolve and fade away into boundless being, and this not a confused state but the clearest of the clear, the surest of the sure, the weirdest of the weird, utterly beyond words, where death was an almost laughable impossibility, the loss of personality (if it were so) seeming no extinction, but the only true life"—such a passage helps us to understand what Buddhists mean by saying that when one is successful in these high and mystic regions "the feeling is simply indescribable; one feels an entirely changed person, purged from the hindrances", those five appalling "hindrances", upon which Buddha fastened so unerringly as the main hamperers of progress towards self-mastery—"hankering after the world", "ill will", "torpor of heart and mind", "flurry and worry" with the fretting and the irritability that brings, and "wavering".

But this higher mystic psychic discipline is not essential: laymen, too, can become arahats and reach Nirvana (are there not some thirty who gained the supreme goal mentioned in the Buddhist scriptures?), and there are arahats "dry-visioned", with no skill in trance, who never practised it. The one thing absolutely necessary to attain Nirvana is to keep the Dhamma—that great Buddhist word—to tread the eightfold path, to practise that intense, wholehearted moral discipline that changes one into the character of Buddha. For that is what Buddhist salvation means. Their hearts are full of gratitude to him as "saviour", touched by his long self-sacrifice for them through endless lives. "Let ad-

oration be to the merciful saviour who for millions of kalpas and time beyond reckoning underwent austerities and pain out of compassion to save the world."[30] But to betake oneself to Buddha means to adopt his views and ways: and to be saved by him is to gain his character and nature. And how? One can not try to enter upon the whole "thirty-seven wings", on which men soar, but the entire intense struggle can be summed up in two famous phrases: it is the treading of the eightfold way; it is the snapping of the "ten fetters"; that is to say, ten things must be cast out, and other eight must be lived constantly. To take the latter first: (1) Right views: especially upon the source of suffering and the true remedy for it, which we have been considering. (2) Right aims: especially towards renunciation, kindness and benevolence. (3) Right speech, upon which Buddha lays an impressive stress and has much practical advice and guidance, which those of us who believe our Lord's so tremendous warning that we shall have to give account of every idle word might well study with care and certain profit. (4) Right conduct, including that whole beautiful morality which is summed up in exquisite picture after picture of what a true Buddhist really is. (5) Right livelihood, for our profit must bring suffering to no creature, and no ill to any fellowman—a definition which would rule out how much of our Western ways! (6) Right effort, that is to say, the great fourfold struggle: that evils to which we have not been prone may not spring up in us, that those before which we have fallen may be cast out, that virtues alien to us may be won, and that those that have arisen "may not grow blurred, may multiply, develop, and come to perfection". (7) Right mindfulness, a subject both broad and

[30] Introductory verse of commentary on *Vinaya*. This story of the almost infinitely long preparation of the Buddha awakens in many Buddhist minds much the same feeling as the sacrifices of the Son of God do in us. They are saved only through Buddha's immeasurable self-sacrifice for them.

immensely difficult, but the real point of which seems to be a continual remembrance that there is no personality, and this in order to cast out all selfishness in everything we do and in each action as it comes, killing the devil's pronouns "my" and "mine", as the *Theologia Germanica* puts it, in our Western way. And (8) Right concentration: Samadhi, the highest rung of the long ladder, the ideal state, the destruction of all mental distraction, "the knowledge that nothing in the world will make him violate the principles of a pure life", the spiritualizing of one's thoughts so that no evil can reach the mind at all; and the perfect happiness that there results from that.

To gain it the "ten fetters" must be snapped.[31] And from this point of view there are really four stages in the path. The first consists of breaking the first three fetters—the delusion of self, doubt, and reliance upon mere rites and ceremonies; among those guilty of which last most Buddhists class us Christians, not perhaps without some evidence not very hard to find. A man or woman who has won so far has trodden the first path, and, having gained the necessary insight, enters on the second, by which the next two fetters, bodily passions and ill will are, not indeed destroyed, but weakened, for so persistent are these that utterly to uproot them takes not the second path alone, but the third too.

While the fourth path ends the five remaining fetters —love of life either here or in heaven, pride, and self-righteousness; and, characteristically, last of all, the wound most difficult to heal, comes ignorance. These killed, one has attained Nirvana. For it is an entire misconception to think of that as mere annihilation, or as a something granted after death. Nirvana is enjoyed here. And Nirvana is a spiritual state of sinlessness, and the peace that results therefrom. Long ago Max

[31] Curiously enough, there are more than one set of these fetters, which is confusing.

Müller pointed out that, in all the passages where the word is used in the Dhammapada, there is not one where annihilation is required, and very many where that meaning given to it makes sheer nonsense. And the proof has been accumulating ever since. There are dozens of metaphors employed to bring home to us the pure bliss and peace of that most enviable of conditions: sometimes it is even called immortality.[32] Very often, indeed, it is named "the going-out"; but in innumerable passages it is lust and ill will and dulness that so vanish, and, these gone, one is *in* Nirvana even here. Again and again and again it is, not indeed defined—there is perhaps no definition—but described, in the terms of morality. When one has thoroughly vanquished anger, that is Nirvana, and the like. "Venerable Nagasena, let it be granted that there is no place where Nirvana is stored up. But is there any place where a man may stand, and, by ordering his life aright, realize Nirvana? Yes, oh King, there is such a place. Which then, Nagasena, is that place? Virtue, oh, King, is that place."

Nor does it help very much to draw a distinction between Nibbana (Nirvana upon earth) and Parinibbana (what happens to an arahat after death). For that last word too, so it seems, means, at least on occasion, peace experienced here. The fact is that while the whole trend and point of Buddhism seems clearly to point to the end of being as the outcome of Nirvana: and while often, very often, the most explicit language is employed in that sense, still Buddha, when challenged, refused to be dogmatic as to what awaits the arahat. Just as eternal life, so the gospels make plain, begins here, in this world, and afterwards flows out into something very wonderful and in all ways desirable, but left vague to our minds, in great degree,—so Nirvana, as we see it, is a character

[32] There are Buddhist sects in Japan who have "a happy land". One beautiful feature of their faith is their habit of asking that their heaven be given to some tired soul; and they be allowed to come back to earth to work on for men till the last one is saved.

free from all passion and all selfishness, all fretting and all littleness, very blessed here, and from which there results the best of all possibles at death, which, it seems, must be the end of being: but as Poussin says, "The saints will arrive at the ineffable, at Nirvana, without knowing what Nirvana is, and precisely because they don't know." [33]

Finally, this last point may be noted: Buddhism has small place for a God; yet it believes that woven into the warp and woof of things there is righteousness and a moral law, and—what is even more arresting—that there is a something not very distinguishable from what we call grace, hopelessly out of place though that seems in their system. And yet what are we to make of such a fact as this, that while, normally, the struggle to attain Nirvana is a tremendous and prolonged effort of years and years (even Ananda, the beloved disciple, stuck fast at the third path for very long, till after Buddha's death, indeed), there are many, many instances of simple people being transported to it almost instantaneously:—the boy Nigrodha, while his head was being shaved for admission to the priesthood: Yasa, entering the first path one night, and reaching arahatship next day: many uplifted to it by the hearing of a single verse or sermon.

Surely such facts, embedded in a system that deliberately throws the whole weight of the struggle onto man's own efforts and endeavours, is the most impressive of all possible proofs that at the heart of things there *is* a something that works in us and about us and upon us, something far stronger than our own endeavours, something mysterious yet very real, what we know as the grace of God.[34]

[33] Poussin's *Bouddhisme.*

[34] So, once and again, I have felt: but it is only fair to say that the orthodox Buddhist would deny my interpretation as being merely the evidence of a mind obsessed by Western modes of thinking, and unable to grasp their faith; would, no doubt, explain these instances cited above as cases where, so to speak, karma suddenly ripened·

But—"Buddha is unfathomable by thought, his doctrines are unfathomable by thinking", remarks a famous Buddhist book: and of that, probably, this paper is one more only too obvious and pathetic proof.

where the past lives justified this rapid progress, where this was the one possible outcome of what had gone before. Such is the theory: but to me at least certain of the admitted facts seem difficult to fit into it, appear to break through it.

The Coming of Archbishop Evdokim

By Vera Johnston.

It was of good omen that Archbishop Evdokim, who succeeds Archbishop Platon as Chief Pastor of the Russian Church in North America should, on coming to New York, appear first at a function at which he himself was host: a reception at the Cathedral House, followed by a concert of sacred and secular music by the choir of the Cathedral of Saint Nicholas. It was of good omen too that among Archbishop Evdokim's many American guests were Dr. Greer, Bishop of New York, Dr. Darlington, Bishop of Harrisburg and Bishop Courtney, for this meant that the door of friendship and understanding between the Churches of East and West, opened with such large-hearted generosity by Archbishop Platon, would be kept wide open by his successor. An added symbol of this spiritual continuity was the active cooperation of Bishop Alexander, who has borne the heavy burden of church work since Archbishop Platon's departure, and who holds so secure a place in the hearts of the Russian community in America and of the friends of the Russian Church.

Archbishop Platon in an address before the Church Club in Philadelphia once rather quaintly declared, with the directness and simplicity that were so characteristic of him, that it was the little things, more perhaps than the big things, which kept the Churches apart: for example, the presence of pews in the Western churches, as against the bare simplicity of the East. To accept the

pews, said Archbishop Plâton, would perhaps be harder for members of the Russian Church than to accept Western holy orders. That had never been said before; and it was part of the great service rendered by Archbishop Platon that he brought to light difficulties of just this kind—always with the hope and intention of overcoming them. It was, therefore, a striking proof of Archbishop Evdokim's breadth of mind, his power to adapt himself to a new realm of life, that the Cathedral of Saint Nicholas was at this concert of sacred music filled with seats for His Grace's guests, for the first time in its history.

Speaking very warmly of Archbishop Platon's work for THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, Archbishop Evdokim said to the editor that he was in complete sympathy with its ideal and purpose, and desired to aid in carrying out its work. He did not agree with the brusque and forcible advocates of unity who laid down the law, declaring that this must be added or that subtracted. Unity must come not through controversy but through love: through our love for Christ. Concerning ritual, Archbishop Evdokim said that as we are both soul and body, and therefore our bodies require clothing and food and water, however much we might desire to dispense with eating or drinking or wearing clothes, so the devotion of the soul requires its food and clothing, and finds them in religious ritual. But we must always remember that Christ did not write the Service Book of the Orthodox Church, or of the Episcopal Church, or of any Church. We must not therefore insist on unity in these. Unity must come through love, and the vital matter is not that one should follow this or the other ritual, but that he should love and believe in Christ. The vital matter is not that a man, when he prays, should kneel or stand or sit or fall prostrate; the vital thing is that he shall *pray*. Speaking of his long study of the life of St. John, Archbishop Evdokim said: I wrote as though I were face to face with Christ; I wrote for Him.

In a recent epistle to all the pastors of the Russian

Orthodox Church in North America Archbishop Evdokim shows a very deep and generous appreciation of the humanitarian attainments of other denominations. Here is a quotation to that effect from this epistle:

Allow me to point out to you living examples of the love of some people for their faith, their readiness to sacrifice everything for Christ the Saviour being a great lesson to us. These people do not live beyond distant seas. They live in your midst. Their activity is spent before your eyes: I mean the serving of Christ among various alien religious communities. Saint Basil the Great, in his talk to young men, counselled them to study all good and beautiful writings, even if the authors were heathen, becoming like unto a bee which gathers all the particles necessary for the honey or for wax even from poisonous flowers. Then what do we see among these workers? We see their truly wonderful love of Christ, of their Churches and their brethren. They work for Him in all the lands of the world. They spare no money and no labour; for the sake of Christ they accept any privation. Christ and the welfare of their people is what they hold dear above everything else.

Then, quoting very extensively statistical data in proof of the above statement concerning the educational, the medical, the charitable and literary activities of the Roman Catholics and the various Protestant denominations, big and small, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Adventists, and others, the new Russian Archbishop spoke again to the Orthodox pastors who are to work immediately under him:

My dearest friends, he said, do you realize that living people are behind these long rows of numerals? Numbers verily are nothing but the conventional indicators of living men and working powers. . . . And now, my friends, examine carefully your own activities. Do you work as hard for Christ as these other people right under your eyes?

It was also a proof of his great gift successfully to meet new problems and new situations that Archbishop Evdokim chose music as the medium of communication and good understanding; for music is the universal language, and no side of the life of the Russian Church, and indeed of the whole spiritual genius of Russia, makes so immediate and powerful an appeal to the heart of the West as does the sacred music so marvellously rendered by the voices which Russia alone seems to know how to produce.

Very simply, with great dignity, Archbishop Evdokim welcomed his guests. Then the Cathedral choir spoke for him, rendering with the rich range of voices and harmonies, so distinctive of Russian Church music, parts of the liturgy, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the great things which are the common riches of Christendom, yet with the special imprint and colouring which the Eastern Church and the Russian race have stamped upon them.

In a very striking passage in the Address which he delivered on May 27, on entering the Russian Cathedral in New York for the first time, Archbishop Evdokim has put on record his profound belief in what one may perhaps call nationalism in the life of the Church: Men of learning, said His Grace, tell us that on the same tree, out of thousands of leaves which at the first glance look exactly alike, there are no two identical leaves. This is quite intelligible. The world is a polyhedral mirror which with all possible fulness reflects the wisdom of God. And God's wisdom knows no repetitions. If we behold this astounding variety, this absence of repetition in Nature around us, should we not perceive it even more in the spiritual world? The Lord reveals the completeness of His spirit in humanity as a whole. No nation in the world can contain within itself all the beauty, the depth and joy of God's life. To every nation He has given a special talent of its own. The Lord gave this talent, not that it should be destroyed, still less that it should be done to death, but that it should increase, develop and

reveal its finest sides. The servant who simply kept his talent incurred God's condemnation, as Christ our Saviour tells us. Then what will become of the servant who does not even keep his talent, who loses it or destroys it?

In the principle thus simply and eloquently enunciated by Archbishop Evdokim, what vistas there are of reconciliation, of genuine peace and good-will among men and nations: the differences between nations, in their religious as well as their secular life, are not stumbling-blocks but *revelations of the wisdom of God.* The mind of Christ is so wide, so deep, so rich, that no one race, nothing less than all humanity, suffices to embody and reveal it.

In the same address, with singular self-abnegation, Archbishop Evdokim gave his auditors a vivid insight into his spiritual biography, revealing secrets of the heart which it is always a very real sacrifice to disclose; a sacrifice which he was willing to make, in order that his flock might understand the heart and spirit of their new Pastor.

Since my earliest youth, said Archbishop Evdokim, I have been brought up in unvarying submission to the will of God, in a firm faith in a *Living* God, who is constantly with us. As the years have passed, this submissive obedience has not only never decreased, it has ever increased and grown firmer. I have never known personal joys since I can remember. All my life has been spent in increasing struggle either against want and sorrow, or against the various difficulties in my walk of life. Often in my past life suffering has seemed without end to me, sorrow without a ray of light, difficulties have seemed invincible. Often I have thought that there was no possible issue. Often I have said: Lord, Thou seest that I have done everything to free myself and others from pain and sorrow, yet pain and sorrow continue to stand before me like an insurmountable wall. I can do no more. Thy will be done, Lord! And almost while I was speaking, the insurmountable wall was cleft before me, yielding me a passage, and once more endless vistas of bright and glad-

some existence stood open before me. And once again I walked gladly forward. . . . When I entered the monastic order, I again confessed my submission to the will of God, not so much by repeating the words of the monastic vows, as by repeating the words of a secret inner prayer, the confession of my early youth. Once more I firmly vowed to seek nothing on this earth for myself personally, neither worldly distinction nor high position, neither office nor the friendship of those who are great in this world, nor any of life's joys. . . . And the whole world is my witness that I remained true to this faith, to this confession of mine, to the smallest detail. . . . This is not all. When men have injured me, with deep injustice, I have kept silent, never trying to justify myself or to seek the support of anyone. I firmly believed and knew that right is superior to wrong, that truth sooner or later comes to light. I only prayed fervently that God would pardon those who had distorted the truth. And this eager, fervent and fiery prayer of mine was never barren, vain or unprofitable. It was always marvellously realized before the eyes of all. The impossible became possible. What was impossible for the wealthiest became possible for a pauper who never kept a penny. What was impossible for the mighty of this world became possible for one who ever stood alone. The meaning of human life on earth lies in doing good and, so far as is possible, becoming like unto God. ("Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.") If this be the purpose of every man's life, could the life of a monk be less? My conscience is my witness, when I say that I have tried so far as it was in my power to live on earth for God and for others, to serve both God and man, but not myself.

Among the supremely difficult tasks which, in this spirit, Archbishop Evdokim undertook, and brought to successful accomplishment, are the building of churches, the founding of religious houses for men and women,

where "the prayers which are the source of everything pure and holy on this earth" ascend continually to heaven; the organization of refuges for waifs and orphans, and innumerable deeds of personal help and consolation, which are, perhaps, the most difficult and fruitful of all.

Born in the government of Vladimir, immediately to the northeast of Moscow, the present Archbishop of North America has spent most of his life in the regions about the old capital of Russia, as priest, monk and bishop. Consecrated Bishop of Volokolam, he delivered an address in the Synod Hall in Moscow, on January 2, 1904, which contains memorable passages; of these, one reveals his ideal of the Episcopate; another is a profession of personal religion:

Honoured Chief Pastors! said the newly consecrated bishop: in the Church of Christ, you represent the builders of the mysterious, miraculous tower which is being raised on earth from the beginning, not of dead, soulless stones, but of living, priceless souls. . . I see many ranks of builders who preceded you; I see the predecessors of your predecessors, until at last they are lost in awe-inspiring heights. And on the very summit, on a height almost invisible, I behold our common Chief of all Pastors, Christ our Saviour, in an ineffable radiance of glory!

To set against this eloquent sentence, which perhaps seems to set Christ at a great distance, we have the following confession of faith: I believe that in this unique hour of my life, Christ Himself, through your consecrated hands, offers to me the lot of pastoral service. I believe that Thou art with me, Lord! Not through archaeological demonstrations, not through the researches of philology or by philosophical argument have I been convinced of Thy all-merciful and all-powerful hand. No! Time and again in the course of my life I have beheld Thee. I have even, as it were, touched Thee. More than once Thou hast knocked at the door of my heart. I know that Thou art nearer to man than the air that surrounds him,

nearer than his garments, nearer even than his own body. Looking briefly through the years that I have lived, now only do I see clearly that more than once thou didst touch the secret strings of my heart, drawing me from my earliest childhood towards the path of Thy service. Many a time I turned from Thee, but when I least expected it, I found myself once more placed by Thee on the path which I thought I had left for ever. Through what dangers have I passed unscathed, through Thy leading; out of what abysses didst Thou lift me unhurt; when it has seemed that all was lost, Thou hast come again to lead me into the immensity of Thy boundless world, filling my heart with gladness, and giving me strength and good courage once more to bear my heavy burden up the mountainous path of life. . .

During the stormy years of gestation from which the New Russia is even now being born, the future Archbishop devoted his great powers to the service of the higher ecclesiastical school in Moscow. The period of his service, he tells us, was exceptional, its beginning coinciding with the first harbingers of the future storms which were already quite perceptibly affecting the work of the schools. The central period of his work coincided with the elemental storms of revolts and insurrections which shook Russia to her foundations. Almost unaided, he had to struggle for such discipline as was possible in the school; to quench the fires with his tears. From first to last, he succeeded in keeping the school from complete dissolution and saving all the rebellious spirits from serious and irreparable harm. For eleven years of patient service he toiled at this supremely difficult task, God alone and his heart knowing what trials he passed through.

Translated to the see of Tula, immediately to the south of Moscow, Archbishop Evdokim was there when he was appointed Chief Pastor of North America. But, as it was almost impossible for him to leave Russia at that time, he was transferred for a period of several months to

the Holy Synod at Petrograd, there to take part in the administrative work of the widely extended Russian Church, and at the same time to gather much valuable information concerning that Church's life in North America from those who, having completed their missionary labours here, have returned to their native land. Archbishop Evdokim at the same time did everything in his power to draw closer the bonds which unite the Russian Church to its daughter churches in the New World, and to make all possible provision for the needs and welfare of these daughter churches. Finally, on his way to his new see beyond the Atlantic, His Grace visited, as a representative of the religious life of Russia, the kindred religious communities of Rumania, Bulgaria and Greece.

Then, sailing from Italy, he reached this country towards the end of May, and, as has been recorded, sought the earliest possible opportunity to form cordial relations with those who, in this country, have become known as friends of the Russian Church. It is both interesting and significant that Archbishop Evdokim was the bearer of cordial greetings and gifts from the Emperor and Empress of Russia to two Americans who have rendered special service to the Russian Church in America: Miss Isabel F. Hapgood, the scholarly translator of the Russian Service Book, and Mr. Charles R. Crane, who has so effectively co-operated in the development of Russian Church music here.

Jeremy Taylor[1]

His Doctrine of Toleration

By Frederick J. Powicke.

Taylor was naturally tolerant, *i.e.* he had the kindly spirit which inclines to toleration. "Nature", says his eulogist Rust, "had befriended him much in his constitution; for he was a person of a most sweet and obliging humour, of great candour and ingenuousness . . . his soul was made up of harmony." And religion, which for him meant likeness to Christ and " made up the best part " of his life, enriched his natural kindliness with true charity.

But, taking a theoretical standpoint, what I wish to note is that he was at once tolerant and intolerant; he was tolerant theologically and intolerant ecclesiastically. Let me say something first of the latter. In February 1644–45 the Commissioners of Charles I—at that time in conference with the Parliamentary Commissioners at Uxbridge—brought forward a remarkable proposal. It was to the effect that (the Book of Common Prayer being retained) "Freedom be left to all persons of what opinions soever in matters of ceremony", and that "all the penalties of the laws and customs which enjoin those ceremonies . . . be suspended." As Mr. Gardiner says, the proposal anticipated, curiously, those subsequently made by the Army to Charles in 1647 and also the final settlement of the Toleration Act of 1689. Its intended scope

[1](1613–1667) For biographical details, see article in *National Dictionary of Biography*, and Edmund Gosse's *Life* in *English Men of Letters*, in addition to the well-known *Biography* by Bishop Heber.

is seen in these two clauses:

(1) Wee think it fitt that toleration bee given (by suspending the penaltyes of all laws) both to the Presbyterians and Independents.

(2) Wee think it fitt that the Bishop exercise no act of Jurisdiction, or ordination, without the counsell of the Presbyters, *i.e.* the dean and chapter, and, if it be thought fitt, any other grave ministers of the diocese.[2]

This scheme of toleration is the first of its kind (we meet with) in the seventeenth century; and the significant fact is that the real authors of it were the Oxford Clergy, *i.e.* the Clergy then with Charles in Oxford. Taylor, however, was not one of them. We have evidence that he was just then a prisoner in the hands of the Parliamentary force which broke up the siege of Cardigan Castle (Feb. 11) and found him with Colonel Charles Gerard among the besiegers. But it is certain that the Clergy would not have had his support if he had been there. For we need only glance at the second of his published works: "The Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy . . . asserted against the Aerians and Acephali, Old and New" (1642) to see that, in the assertion of Episcopal claims, he was an extremist. Thus in §46 his text is—"They are schismaticks that separate from their Bishop"; and the sum of his argument (backed up by copious references to Jerome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Cyprian, and "divers Councils") is this: "the Bishop is the band and ligature of the Church's unity and separation from the Bishop is διχονοιας σύμβολον (as Theodoret's expression is), a symbol of faction, and he that separates is a schismatick." [3]

Hooker had defended Episcopacy; but had done so on the ground of its expediency and intrinsic excellence. He did not think it necessary. Churches might exist without it; might choose "a less admirable" form of government, and one, as he believed, less in consonance

[2] The full text of the *Proposals* is quoted by Gardiner in the *English Historical Review*, April, 1887, Vol. II, pp. 340–2.

[3] The last words of the paragraph are "in no case is it lawful to separate from Episcopacy: *that* is the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow of Christianity, and a confronting of a Divine institution".

with Scripture; but might still be true Churches. Their choice of a less admirable form of government was in no sense fatal.

"Men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them." [4]

But the doctrine of an absolute divine right in episcopacy, along with the doctrine of a similar right in monarchy, had grown apace since Hooker's day; and Taylor, like his friend and patron Laud, heartily espoused both. Read some of the positions concerning the royal supremacy which Taylor maintains, with his usual casuistic dexterity, in a chapter of his "Ductor Dubitantium"[5] (1660):

"the supreme power in every republic is universal, absolute and unlimited; it is not lawful for subjects to rebel, or to take up arms against the supreme power of the nation, upon any pretence whatsoever; Kings have a legislative power in the affairs of religion and the church; the supreme civil power hath a power of coercion of every person in the whole order Ecclesiastical; the supreme civil power hath jurisdiction in causes not only ecclesiastical but internal and spiritual; the supreme civil power is to govern in causes ecclesiastical by the means and measures of Christ's institution, *i.e.* by the assistance and ministries of ecclesiastical persons".

The theoretical basis of the Laudian régime could hardly be more clearly exposed. Given a King endowed by God with legislative and coercive power in the Church; join with him, at the same time, Ministers of the Church through whom, as likewise possessing Divine authority, his power is exercised, and what view will be taken of nonconformity, and what will be its treatment? It will be viewed as schism, and treated as sedition. This was Taylor's position. Even in his "Liberty of Prophesying" he does not conceal it. When that great treatise is commended as a plea for toleration in general—when Heber, *e.g.* commends it as "the first attempt on record to conciliate the minds of Christians to the reception of a doctrine which . . . was then, by every sect alike,

[4] Hooker. [5] Pt. II, Bk. III, cap. 3.

regarded as a perilous and portentous novelty", he is not only wrong in fact, but his statement needs the large qualification that Taylor was against the sort of toleration which was then most in debate. I mean the toleration of differences in Church Government and Worship. Uniformity in the externals of worship, he argues, is desirable in itself; uniformity in the externals of episcopal worship is excellent; the King may establish such uniformity and empower the Church to maintain it; and, this being done, all good subjects will submit. Some may be dissatisfied; and, if they are content "privately to converse and to opine as they see cause, and as they mean to answer to God", Taylor would let them alone. He had no wish, nor indeed had Laud, to exact from all men a *positive* consent to the established religion.

> "For if it be necessary for all men to subscribe to the present established Religion, by the same reason, at another time, a man may be bound to subscribe to the contradictory, and so to all Religions in the world".[6]

But open defiance whether by speech, or act, is another matter. People who publicly denounce the established religion, or publicly assemble for a worship of their own, are rending Christ's seamless robe and breaking the peace; and for no sufficient reason—even though they plead "a weak conscience". "For a weak conscience signifyes nothing in this case but a dislike of the law upon a contrary purswasion";[7] and if the law is allowed to be broken for such a conscience, not only will the many obedient citizens be justly offended, but it will tend to the total overthrow of all discipline. Taylor discusses the question whether provision for weak consciences could not be made in the "very framing of the law of discipline", and concludes that this would end in "making the law ridiculous and the authority contemptible"—since the exceptions, necessary on the score of "weak consciences",

[6] "Liberty of Prophesying", §16. 4. [7] §17. 3.

would be endless. The true way out of the difficulty, namely, that the State should assume no responsibility at all for the establishing of religion, did not occur to him even in his dreams. He took the line that things relating to externals of religion are indifferent or (as he says) "adiaphorous"; that, in this sphere, conscience may safely, and should, be determined by the law; that at any rate passive obedience to the law is a higher duty than active obedience to any mere scruple of conscience.

"Lawes are the mirrour in which men are to dresse and compose their actions, and therefore must not be broken with such clauses of exception which may without remedy be abused to the prejudice of authority and peace and all human sanctions. And I have knowne, in some Churches, that this pretence hath been nothing but a designe to discredit the Law, to dismantle the authority that made it, to raise their owne credit, and a trophey of their zeale, to make it a characteristick note of a sect, and the cognisance of holy persons. . . And which is the worst of all, they who were perpetually clamorous that the severity of the Lawes should slacken as to their particular, and, in matter adiaphorous . . . to indulge a leave to them to doe as they list, yet were the most imperious amongst men, most decretory in their sentences, and most impatient of any disagreeing from them, though in the least minute and particular. . . "[8]

These last words are a reference (and not an unfair one) to the Puritans.

His tone grew sharper in the course of time. In a sermon preached at the opening of the Irish Parliament (8th May 1661) he speaks of tender consciences (*i.e.* the consciences of a Papist, a Presbyterian, an Independent, an Anabaptist, a Quaker) with contempt. They "cannot endure milk, but can very well digest iron"; "a ceremony is greatly offensive to them", "but a rebellion is not"; "a surplice drives them away as a bird affrighted with a man of clouts", but it costs them no pang "to despise government, speak evil of dignities. . . commit sacrilege and account schism the characteristic of saints". Moreover, "if you put the law in exercise against 'em" they put on a meek face. They will obey you passively because you are stronger; and so long as they know you

[8] §17. 6.

are stronger "they will not stir against you; but they, in the meantime, are little else than martyrs, and you no better than persecutors". His advice to Parliament in the same sermon is to enforce the law rigorously.

"You have no other way of peace, no better way to appease and quiet the quarrels in religion which have been so long among us; but by reducing all men to obedience, and all questions to the measures of the laws".

And he would seem to have thoroughly meant what he said. For when he was crossed by the Presbyterian clergy of his diocese who refused to recognize his episcopal jurisdiction he at once adopted severe measures and even turned thirty-six of them out of their "charges". Nay, his attitude towards schism, or declared nonconformity, in respect of the established Church, was worthy of some modern Ritualists we have heard of. It so narrowed his spiritual outlook that he could bring himself to believe and say:

"The Spirit of God is to be found in Churches and pulpits, upon altars, and in a Doctor's chair, not in conventicles and mutinous corners of a house".

In all this, of course, he was Laud's scholar—though incapable, by reason of his personal gentleness, of Laud's cruelties; and he did not grasp the force of his own words (in another connection):

"Whether of the two is the schismatick? hee that makes unnecessary and (supposing the state of things) in convenient impositions, or hee that disobeyes them because hee cannot, without doing violence to his conscience, believe them? hee that parts Communion because without sinne hee could not entertain it, or they that have made it necessary for him to separate. . . "?[9]

We have seen that his practice as Bishop and his sermon before the Irish Parliament are anticipated by what he said in the "Liberty of Prophesying" and even in the "Episcopacy asserted". The charge of inconsistency,[10] therefore, so often made against him is not fair.

[9] "Liberty of Prophesying", §22. i.

[10] He aims at refuting this charge in "the Epistle Dedicatory"—to Lord Hatton—of "a collection of (his) polemical and moral Discourses (*σύμβολον ἠθικο-πολέμικον*, 1657), which includes the Second Edition of the "Liberty of Prophesying".

Orme, for example, in his *Life of John Owen*, says that Taylor "published the most effectual recantation of his former opinions, or sincerity", in becoming "a member of the Privy Council of Charles II from which all the persecuting edicts against the poor nonconformists proceeded"; and Heber's answer is that "though Bishop Taylor was a nominal member of the Irish Privy Council there is no reason to suppose that he took a part in the measures of any administration, and that the administration of Ireland did not in fact during the reign of Charles II persecute the dissenters". But the right answer is that had Taylor been more than a nominal member of the Irish Council, or had he actually taken part in acts of persecution against dissenters, he would only have been giving practical effect to the logic of his earlier position. There is a story vouched for by Nicholls (in his *Illustrations of Literary History*, Vol. VII, p. 464) that Taylor, "finding a very improper use had been made of his famous book the 'Liberty of Prophesying', . . . sent his Chaplain from Ireland to buy up all the copies he could find; and, having brought them to Dromore, the Bishop set a day apart for fasting and praying, and then, in the evening, caused a fire to be made in the courtyard and burnt these books". The story lacks corroboration and sounds unlikely; but if the misuse of his book consisted in what was certainly the fact, *viz.* that Dissenters and others quoted it as a plea for the toleration of public acts which broke up the uniformity of the established Church, it is not difficult to conceive how he resented this; or how his resentment might be expressed in some such emphatic way.

His discourse was meant to apply, not to differences in the sphere of Church "order", but to differences in the sphere of opinion. So I come to our second point, that theologically Taylor was tolerant. And it is important to observe that, in this respect, he did not stand alone among Churchmen. Had you lived during the last days of Elizabeth, or at any time during the first fifty or sixty

years of the seventeenth century; and had you gone in search of men willing to grant you intellectual elbow room; willing to let you sift received doctrines of faith in the light of reason, or willing to discuss difficulties with you and bestow a calm consideration upon your doubts, you would have found them among Churchmen. Not Cartwright and Travers, but Richard Hooker would have stood your friend, and constrained you, with persuasive eloquence, to realize the grand harmony of all truth, the manifold forms of its revelation, the various ways of arriving at it, the necessary limits of human knowledge, the necessary things to know, the sacred rights of reason as well as Scripture, and the unfailing light it yields to every humble mind in the interpretation of things human and Divine. Even so in Taylor's day, theological tolerance had its home mainly with those whom we should call broad, or high, Churchmen. The choice spirits whom Lord Falkland gathered around himself at Great Tew were Churchmen, clerical or lay. John Hales of Eton was a Churchman. Benjamin Whichcote, Henry More, John Smith, Ralph Cudworth, Nathaniel Culverwell,—those bright and morning stars of a freer spiritual movement at Cambridge—were Churchmen. Most, or all, of these come under the head of "broad"—*i.e.* their attachment to the Church, though genuine, was not extreme. They admired its Liturgy because it was venerable, or decent and sober, or solemn and stately; not because it was incapable of being improved. Taylor was a high Churchman, but broad theologically, nevertheless. So, on the whole, was Laud. Laud could cut off a man's ears for scoffing at ceremonies, or flouting a Bishop; but he was, comparatively speaking, an enlightened theologian. So far as I am aware he never persecuted a man merely because of his theology. Theological rancour was, in his eyes, the besetting sin of the Puritans; and sprang from, or at least was sanctioned by, their habit of educing everything from the letter of Scripture

by a species of distorted logic which took no account of reason. Reason, he said—in the manner of Hooker, who seems to have had some influence on him,—is the "bulwark not the slave of Religion"; and he abominated the opinion that "God from all Eternity reprobates by far the greater part of mankind to Eternal fire without any eye at all to their sin" on the ground that "it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world". He adhered to the Thirty-nine Articles and denied that any of them was superstitious or erroneous; but still held it to be a sign of the Church's "boldly free and tolerant" attitude that she had never declared every one of them fundamental to the faith. Some are fundamental—those, namely, which are common to the ancient Christian creeds, particularly the Apostolic—and it was his chief aim (says his latest biographer, Mr. Hutton) to suggest these as "articles of peace". Mr. Gardiner goes further and claims that Laud's refusal to submit his mind to the dogmatism of Puritanism; and his appeal to the cultivated intelligence for the solution of religious problems had an ever-increasing response, even in regions in which his memory is devoted to contemptuous obloquy.

It is a strange phenomenon—this union of theological breadth with ecclesiastical intolerance. It was not an isolated phenomenon. It is conspicuous in another great pupil of Laud's, Hammond, whose sermons are rich in exhortations to tolerance and in sound reasons for it. It appeared also in many others; and is with us still. We are all familiar with the high Churchman of broad theological sympathies—one who can be at once a fearless critic of the Bible and a fanatic for obeying every Rubric of the Prayer Book. And I suppose there can be no doubt that all parties in the Church, while willing perhaps to maintain a broad principle of comprehension in matters of opinion, would stoutly resist any extensive change in

its ritual. What is the reason? The late Archbishop Temple said the answer is plain.

"It is the unity of ceremonial that makes the diversity of opinion possible. The ceremonial stands before us as the order of the Church; the teaching is, and must be, to a very great extent, the voice of the individual".

Laud said much the same in one of his "epistles dedicatory" to Charles I; but added his view of the reason why Unity of Ceremonial is the order of the Church.

"It is true the inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service is acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world that our heart stands right in the service of God. Take this away, or bring it into contempt, and what light is there left to shine before men, that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in Heaven? And to deal clearly with Your Majesty these thoughts are they, and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men, nor no example for men".[11]

It is well to know a man's motives, if we would judge him fairly, however unsatisfactory they may seem to be.

"The Liberty of Prophesying"—otherwise named "Theologia Eclectica"—came out in 1647, that year of "desperate hope" for the Presbyterians when, to their horror, the Army's Heads of Proposals and a series of discussions in Parliament seemed to bring to their doors the toleration so long and passionately resisted—a year, therefore, favourable to its plea. The book is, in no sense,original—though Taylor neither acknowledges indebtedness to any of his contemporaries or predecessors, nor indeed mentions them. Its distinction is that it condensed and expressed, with rich and sometimes turgid eloquence, thoughts which had filtered into his mind—consciously or unconsciously—from such men as I have already named, Hooker, John Hales, the Cambridge Platonists, Chillingworth, even Laud. He had been in Cambridge at a time when Whichcote was already beginning to wield his unique influence

[11]Laud's *Works*, II, p. 16, "Epistle Dedicatory" to a relation of the *Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher.*

over the minds of young enquirers, and to call them off from the husks of theology to the essentials of religion; and he was in Oxford just when Wm. Chillingworth, to whom he owed most, was publishing his "*Religion of Protestants*". Acquaintance with the latter—book and man—may be taken for granted; and one can hardly doubt that he knew something of the former, possibly too of John Smith, Cudworth, and Henry More.

Taylor's argument in outline is this: (1) conflicting opinions are the trouble; (2) conflicting opinions are inevitable; (3) Scripture, which contains the sum of Divine truth, offers from its very nature no sure protection; and (4) in the last resort, a man must trust to the honest use of his own reason; (5) but common ground is laid in the Apostles' creed, which is a synopsis of fundamental truths, and, uniting here, Christians may and should tolerate all minor differences.

The last is the main thing, and a few sentences will suffice to bring us up to it. As to the first point, he says,

> "Men are now-a-dayes, and indeed alwayes have been, since the expiration of the first blessed ages of Christianity, so in love with their own Fancies and Opinions, as to think faith and all Christendome is concerned in their support and maintenance; and whoever is not so fond and does not dandle them like themselves, it growes up to a quarrell, which, because it is in *materia theologiae*, is made a quarrell in Religion, and God is entitled to it; and then, if you are once thought an enemy to God, it is our duty to persecute you even to death, we doe God service in it. . . . We by this time are come to that passe, we think we love not God except we hate our Brother, and we have not the vertue of Religion, unless we persecute all Religions but our own."[12]

Yet it is impossible that all should be of one mind—considering "such variety of principles, such several constitutions, educations, tempers, hopes, interests, and weaknesses, degrees of light and degrees of understanding"[13] to which men are subject.

But have we not a sure guide and standard in Scripture? True, the Bible *is* the word of God and worthy of

[12]"Liberty of Prophesying", Introduction. [13]Ibid.

implicit faith. Nevertheless, it is a book very hard to interpret:

" . . . that there are innumerable places containing in them great mysteries but yet so enwrapped with a cloud, or so darkened with umbrages, or, so heightened with expressions, or so covered with allegories and garments of Rhetoric; so profound in the matter, or so clothed and made intricate in the manner, in the clothing and in the dressing, that God may seeme to have left them as tryals of our industry and arguments of our imperfections. . . rather than the repositories of Faith and furniture of Creeds and Articles of belief".[14]

Yes; but granting this, is there no means of drawing out and setting forth the truth, the whole truth, of Scripture in a way and form universally convincing? There is tradition, for instance, and "councils ecclesiastical" and the Pope, and the early Fathers; cannot any of these, or the whole of them together, supply light enough to clear up all difficulties? Taylor examines each of these external authorities at length and discloses in each some fatal lack. He glances, finally, at the pretension of certain enthusiasts to an internal authority of the Spirit, and dismisses it as impertinent to the question.

"For put the case, the Spirit is given to some men, enabling them to expound infallibly, yet because this is but a private assistance and cannot be proved to others, this infallible assistance may determine my own assent, but shall not enable me to prescribe to others, because it were unreasonable I should, unless I could prove to him that I have the Spirit, and so can secure him from being deceived, if he relyes upon me. In this case I may say, as *S. Paul*, in the case of praying with the Spirit, *'He verily giveth thanks well; but the other is not edified.'* " [15]

The situation then is this:—Truth is given in the Scriptures and nothing but Truth, but they are crowded with dark places as to which neither Tradition nor Councils, nor the Pope, nor the Fathers, nor private light of the Spirit can produce a common and undoubted certainty. What remains? There remains the authority of reason.

" . . . it is best to follow our guides if we know nothing better; but if we doe, it is better to follow the pillar of fire than a pillar of cloud—though both possibly may lead to *Canaan*. . ."[16]

[14]"Liberty of Prophesying", §3. 1.
[15]"Liberty of Prophesying", §9. 3.
[16]§10. 3.

The pillar of fire is Reason. The pillar of cloud is Authority; both guides, and so not mutual enemies.

"For it is a good argument for us to follow such an opinion because it is made sacred by the authority of Councells and Ecclesiasticall Tradition, and sometimes it is the best reason we have in a question, and then it is to be strictly followed; but there may also be, at other times, a reason greater than it that speaks against it, and then the authority must not carry it".[17]

Reason in fact—"like logick" (says Taylor)—is

"instrument of all things else; and when Revelation and Philosophie, and publick Experience, and all other grounds of probability or demonstration, have supplied us with matter, then Reason does but make use of them; that is, in plain terms, there being so many wayes of arguing, so many sects, such differing interests, such variety of authority, so many pretences and so many false beliefes, it concernes every wise man to consider which is the best argument, which proposition relies upon the truest grounds; and if this were not his only way, why doe men dispute and urge arguments, why doe they cite Councils and Fathers, why do they alledge Scripture & Tradition, and all this on all sides, and to contrary purposes? If we must judge, then we must use our reason; if we must not judge, why do you produce evidence?" [18]

So then,

"Scripture, Tradition, Councells, and Fathers, are the evidence. . . but Reason is the judge; that is, we being the persons that are to be perswaded, we must see that we be perswaded reasonably. . . "[19]

Taylor fully admits that, in consequence of the various "causes of error"—causes "exculpate" in themselves—which beset the honest thinker, he will often go wrong. But, as a rule, this does not greatly matter. "Heresy is not an errour of the understanding but an errour of the will."[20] Truth may be missed, yet the sincere desire and effort to attain it makes a true man. And a true

"a good man that believes what according to his light and upon the use of his moral industry he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or no, because he hath a minde desirous of truth, and prepared to believe every truth, is therefore acceptable to God because nothing hindered him from it but what hee could not help, namely, his misery and weaknesse meerly naturall, which being imperfections which God never punishes, he stands fair for a blessing of his morality which God always acceptes".[21]

[17] § 10. 5. [18] Ibid. [19] Ibid. [20] § 2. 8. [21] § 2. 21.

On the other hand

"whatever an ill man believes, if he therefore believe it because it serves his own ends, be his belief true or false, the man hath an hereticall minde, for to serve his own ends, his minde is prepared to believe a lie".[22]

Errors, then, are blameworthy only so far as they have a moral root; while the errors which spring from involuntary causes are blameless because practically inevitable. Certainly much can be done to contract the range of error. "Diligence and care in obtaining the best guides, and the most convenient assistances, prayer, and modesty of spirit, simplicity of purposes and intentions, humility and aptnesse to learn and a peaceable disposition" [23] are valuable allies in the search for truth. But not even the wisest of men, unless infected with the heresy of pride, will fancy himself free from error, or be unready to suspect that it may enter, more or less, into opinions which make up his clearest convictions; and which, consequently, have for his own conscience, the binding force of truth.

Thus the conclusion is reached that the basis of toleration cannot be uniformity of opinion. We may all be seeking the truth; we may all think we have found it; we may all miss it; let us recognize this fact and bear with one another in a spirit of love. For

"it is not the differing Opinions that is the cause of the present ruptures, but want of charity; it is not the variety of understandings, but the disunion of wills and affections . . . a holy life will make our belief holy, if we consult not humanity and its imperfections, in the choice of our Religion, but search for truth without designes, save only of acquiring heaven, and then be as careful to preserve Charity as we were to get a point of Faith. I am perswaded we should find out more truths by this meanes; or however (which is the maine of all) we shall be secured though we misse them; and then we are well enough".[24]

Such is Taylor's conclusion; and one would say that it promises toleration for all opinions sincerely held *without exception*. This surely is the logical inference, and is the

[22] § 2. 21. [23] § 12. 6.
[24] "Liberty of Prophesying", Introduction.

one implicitly granted by Taylor himself in the beautiful legend,[25] for example, with which he closes his Treatise:

"When Abraham sat at his tent door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers, he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travel, coming towards him—who was a hundred years of age. He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, and caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man eat and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, asked him, why he did not worship the God of heaven? The old man told him that he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other God; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was? He replied, I thrust him away because he did not worship *thee;* God answered him, *I* have suffered him these 100 years, although he dishonoured me, and couldst *thou* not endure him one night, when he gave thee no trouble? Upon this, saith the story, Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction. Go and do thou likewise and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham."

But it cannot quite be said that Taylor did likewise. For, after all, he drew a sharp line within which differences of opinion ceased to be tolerable. True, this line enclosed a circle very small comparatively. It shut out a vast number of disputed points, which, to a Presbyterian like Samuel Rutherford—who did his angry best to refute Taylor—were of vital concern for a sound and saving Christian faith. Judged by the dominant standard of his time, it exhibits an uncommon breadth of view and largeness of heart. But we are judging it now in the light of his avowed principle—that all sincere opinions, however mixed with error, are blameless—and then we are struck with its singular inconsequence. There are, he says, certain fundamentals. Thus there is a fundamental creed for the Gentiles—one presupposed in the Christian creed, and revealed to the honest Gentile

[25]Added to the Second Edition (1657) and since traced to the Persian poet, Saadi. It was quoted by George Gentius in the Epistle Dedicatory to his translation of a Jewish work (1657). This would account for Taylor's reference to this apologue as found by him in the "Jews Books". Heber's *Life of Taylor*, p. 210.

conscience, as the Cambridge Platonist would have said, by "natural light", namely, "he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him". From the context Taylor appears to mean that a Gentile, failing of this creed, căn not be saved.[26]

There is, too, a fundamental creed for Christians. My impression is, though Taylor is not very explicit, that he put a wholesale belief in the Divine authority of the Scriptures among the fundamentals. But what else they are he reiterates clearly. In the abstract, that is of the foundation of faith, "the knowing or not knowing" of which; "the believing or disbelieving" of which, "is in immediate and necessary order to salvation or damnation".[27] In the concrete, what saves us, and so is fundamental, is faith in "that great mysteriousness of Christianity which Christ taught with so much diligence; for the credibility of which he wrought so many miracles; for the testimony of which the Apostles endured persecutions . . . " that is "*Jesus Christ crucified*". Essentially, "this is the article upon the confession of which Christ built his Church, *viz.* only upon St. Peter's creed which was no more but this simple enunciation: '*We believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*'" It is Martha's creed (John 11: 27)—to which "salvation particularly is promised". It is the creed of the fourth Gospel, expressive of the writer's sole end and purpose—"*These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God and that believing ye might have life through His name.*" It is the creed which, at first, was accounted sufficient to prepare a candidate for Baptism, as appears in the case of the Ethiopian Eunuch. Its necesary and obvious implicates are evolved, but nothing is added, "in the short and admirable mysterious creed of St. Paul in Rom. 10:8—'*This is the word of faith which we preach; that if thou*

[26]"Liberty of Prophesying", §1. 5. [27]§1. 2.

shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved'". Here, says Taylor, we have "the great and intire complexion of a Christian's faith; and since salvation is promised to the beliefes of this creed, either a snare is laid for us, with a purpose to deceive us, or else nothing is of prime and original necessity to be believed but this *Jesus Christ our Redeemer*"—along with those simple propositions which describe "the necessary parts, meanes or maine actions of working this redemption for us". And the sum is this—"Jesus Christ the Sonne of the living God, the Crucifixion an,d Resurrection of Jesus, forgiveness of sinnes by His blood Resurrection of the dead, and life Eternal".[28] To the explicit belief of these articles, and of these only, salvation is promised. Therefore, these only are necessary and sufficient. We see that the foundation has already broadened considerably from its first simple constituent. But it appears that the Apostles themselves made it still broader. They expounded the articles just mentioned into the creed cited under their name, which creed contains the final instructions "delivered by the Holy Apostles and their fellow-labourers to the Holy Churches of God". It is the "correct and blameless faith" "without any mixture of novelty or innovation". Nor is it to be regarded as a compendium of "generall principles in the bosome of which many more articles equally necessary to be believed explicitely . . . are infolded". "It is as minute an explication of those *prima credibilia* I before reckoned as is necessary to salvation." This must follow, thinks our author, from the fact that the Apostles made the creed, and were sure not to put in anything needless, or to leave out anything essential. "They did an act of public notice", as it were, and proclaimed to the Church of their time and of all times—here is the last, full, divinely authorized, system of saving truth where-

[28] §1. 3, 4, 5.

of you must never fall short and beyond which you must never go.[29]

But what has become now of Taylor's principle that the basis of toleration must be sought in unity of the Spirit, in charity out of a pure heart, in an earnest and sincere will towards the truth, or in an earnest and sincere conviction of possessing it, a moral attitude, in short, which secures to all men, even to Abraham's old Gentile fire-worshipper, acceptance with God? We are now required to limit our toleration to the adherents of a creed. True, it is a comparatively simple creed, one elastic enough to make it possible for him to tolerate the Anabaptists on the one hand, and the Roman Catholics on the other—so far as their theology was concerned. But it is a creed nevertheless; and a creed, moreover, determined by opinion, his own opinion, in the first place (and of course the one generally accepted in his time), that the Apostles were its immediate authors; and, in the second place, his opinion that it held nothing doubtful and comprised everything essential[30]—an opinion sure to issue in just the kind of controversy which he was anxious to allay and avoid. For instance, in December 1652 "divers ministers and others" presented to the Honourable Committee of Parliament a Sheet of Proposals for the furtherance and propagation of the Gospel; and, bound up with these, some principles of Christian religion (sixteen in number) *without the belief of which the Scriptures do plainly and clearly affirm salvation is not to be obtained.* Among the signatories were John Owen, John Dury, Philip Nye, William Greenhill, and among the principles were these:—that God is one in three persons, that Jesus Christ is true God, that God is to be worshipped according to His Own Will; and, *whosoever shall forsake and despise all the duties of his worship cannot be saved.*

[29] § 1. 7, 8, 9.

[30] Except "the article of Christ's descent into Hell which was not in the old creed", § 1. 8.

Evidently, to these sincere men the articles of the Apostles' Creed were by no means sufficient, and men like Taylor or Richard Baxter, who thought they were, seemed to them sinfully lax. They had many sympathizers, while there were others in whose opinion even these were not strict enough, such as the Sion College Ministers who, in this very year of Taylor's "Prophesying" (December 1647), sent forth a "Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ and to our Solemn League and Covenant, as also against the errours, Heresies and Blasphemies of these times and the Toleration of them"—errors which they profess "utterly to loathe, execrate and abhorre" on account of their sure effect in sapping the foundation of the faith.

On the other hand, no one doubts that Milton was a sincere and earnest man, prepared for any sacrifice in defence of what he believed to be the Truth; yet he is known to have shown scant respect towards those outward duties of God's worship which—said John Owen and the rest—"whosoever shall forsake and despise cannot be saved"; nor is it improbable that he had serious doubts about the Trinity; and as to the Deity of Jesus Christ. John Biddle, again, was a sincere and earnest man. Truth was the ruling passion of his life. He employed just those means commended by Taylor for the finding of it. He gave the Holy Scriptures—we are told—"a diligent reading, and made use of no other rule to determine controversies about religion than the Scriptures; and of no other authentic interpreter, if a scruple arose, concerning the sense of the Scriptures than reason". Nevertheless, his conclusions were far from being at one with the Apostles' Creed. He rejected the orthodox doctrine of Christ's Deity. He adduced twelve arguments against the commonly received opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit. He became, in short, "the Father of the English Unitarians". Biddle's writings were burned by the common hangman. He had to suffer

years of imprisonment; was in danger of death through that dreadful ordinance of 1648, called forth chiefly by his views; and endured a cruel banishment to the Isle of Scilly. And Taylor, testing him by his scheme of fundamentals, could only acquiesce in the whole process of persecution as justified. At the same time he himself, being tested by the Presbyterian or Independent scheme of fundamentals, likewise stood condemned, if not for the denial, yet for the omission, of articles deemed necessary for salvation. And if he urged the plea, "But my scheme is all that the Scriptures, or the Apostles, deemed necessary"—of course, the obvious retort was, *That* is just the matter in dispute.

This, indeed, is what must always come of attempts to mark off the limit of toleration by any credal test. There will inevitably be those who resent it as implying a base betrayal of essential truth; and those, again, who resent it as partially or wholly false. The latter you must persecute, the former will want to persecute you. Even supposing the very unlikely event that a credal test, agreeable to all minds, were found, it could not last. Time—sooner or later—would break it down. Supposing, for example, that in Taylor's day all contentions had been hushed and all Christians had agreed in accepting *his* credal test, how could their unanimity have survived the shock—say—of critical enquiry as to the authorship of the apostolic symbol; or how long could men have been prevented from putting some of its articles to the question; or, if force was ever applied to silence dissentient voices, where would be the longed for peace?

So with every conceivable concordat based on intellectual formulas. Not that we are thereby driven to the inference: Then nothing is certain, nothing quite clear and assured to what we call Christian consciousness. There is much. But the right inference is this: That the field for toleration is wider than the Christian consciousness, is wide as the world; and you want a principle

which can bring within the range of your tolerant respect and treatment men everywhere, men of every creed and nation. Nor could I wish a better statement of this principle than in Taylor's own words—"It concernes all persons to see that they doe their best to find out truth, and if they doe, it is certain that let the errour be never so damnable they shall escape the errour, or the misery of being damn'd for it." [31]

[31] "Liberty of Prophesying", § 22. 3.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Unity

By William T. Manning, S.T.D.

The minds of men today are turned toward unity. They are at least becoming convinced of the practical evils of division. And there is a manifest longing for a unity that has outward and visible expression. The idea of a unity with no outward manifestation, a soul without a body, has not been justified by experience. It has become evident that those who preach a mere invisible unity propagate actual disunion. It is plain that there can be no adequate unity among Our Lord's followers until it shall again become possible for them, without violation of principle or of conscience, to kneel together at one Altar, there to eat of the One Bread and to drink of the One Cup. And in many quarters Christians are realizing with new hope that Our Lord Himself prayed not only for an inward and spiritual unity which men

could not see, but for a unity outwardly and visibly manifested which should compel their attention, and which should be the proof of His Presence among them. His prayer for His Church was, and still is, "that they all may be one, even as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us, that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me".

In the United States especially the religious situation is such as to bring home the need of reunion and to accentuate the desire for it. The process of disintegration has been carried further here than elsewhere. The experiment of division on the principle of individualism has been very fully worked out, and it is becoming only too clear that the theory of "the Churches" is weakening if not destroying all real belief in The Church. According to the latest statistics there are now in this country more than one hundred and sixty separate denominations bearing the name Christian. Our people thus have before them a striking object lesson and it is producing an effect. They see that the religious need of the country is not being effectively met. They see the grievous weakness, the waste of strength and resources resulting from the divisions among the Christian forces. And there is a growing impatience with this condition which is not without dangers of its own.

There is a tendency to place disproportionate emphasis on the practical advantages of unity to the obscuration of the higher considerations involved, and so to think of it only from the utilitarian point of view. It is a great gain that in the United States we are coming generally to see the disadvantages of division. But we have not yet at all generally arrived at a realization of what unity means. Many are disposed to accept some expedient or substitute for it which falls far below the true ideal. If we are to work effectively for reunion we must have the true ideal of it before us. We need to see, and shall without doubt in time see, far more generally and clearly than we now do,

the difference between any mere humanly devised scheme of union and the true Divinely given unity.

There is danger also in the increasing desire for quick results. Earnest but impatient souls cry out that there is no need for all this talk about the matter. If we want unity, all that we have to do is to "get together". Let the divisions be ignored, questions of doctrine are all of them unimportant, we should be ashamed to be kept apart by "our petty differences".

These pronouncements have an engaging and pleasant sound to the man in the street. They impress him as broad minded—wide awake—up to date. But they do not bear careful examination. They imply the entire unimportance of Christian Truth. That Life which came into this world in Christ is also "the Light". "The Life is the Light of men." Truth is second in importance only to Love. The ideal of unity without truth in the Church is as fallacious as the ideal of peace without righteousness in the State. The road to unity is not so simple and easy as this. The mistakes and sins of our fathers, and of ourselves are not to be so lightly atoned for and retrieved. Differences which have persisted through centuries can not be adjusted over night. The deep convictions of men's souls can not be dealt with in this fashion and the attempt so to deal with them results inevitably in irritations, misunderstandings and widened divisions. Doubtless some of the matters which have separated Christians are unimportant, perhaps even "petty" in themselves, but we must beware how we apply this word to any belief which expresses a sincere conviction. Nor must we make the kindred mistake of assuming that convictions with which we do not agree, and which perhaps stand in the way of some plan of united action in which we are interested, are the proof of narrowness and self-will. Pride and self-will are strong in all of us but they are as easily manifested by the casting away of doctrines as by holding fast to them. The fact that a man has religious convictions

which he can not compromise is in itself no evidence of a wrong spirit or of a lack of charity.

One of our greatest needs is to see clearly how deep and fundamental some of the differences are which at present divide Christians, so that we may in some measure realize the difficulties in the way of reunion and may not be discouraged because its progress is slow.

There is a growing tide of sentiment in favour of Christian reunion without much regard to Christian principles. A great number of people seem to think that religion means little more than moral conduct and general amiability, and therefore take it for granted that union in religious work, under any circumstances, must be right, and that any objection to it must necessarily be wrong. In this situation the position and mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is one of great responsibility and opportunity. And in the interests of good understanding as well as of intelligent effort toward reunion, it is important that her relation to the situation should be clearly understood.

In the Providence of God it would seem that the Episcopal Church, together with the Churches which are included in the Anglican Communion, has a special work to do toward bringing about a great synthesis in the whole of Christendom. Her mission seems to be to hold up, and bear witness to, the ideal of Christian Reunion in its fullest and largest meaning. She has been given a special relation to the world situation as a whole and she must be true to it. By her fundamental faith as to the nature of the Church and also by the practical facts of her history and life she is called to look at the question of reunion in its world-wide aspect and, to the best of her power, "to think in terms of the whole". To a singular degree she is enabled and required by the peculiarities of her position to take into account the factors on both the Catholic and Protestant sides in the West and also to realize the great place which belongs to the Ancient East-

ern Orthodox Churches, as to which until recently many of us have been so amazingly ignorant, and which are now coming into close touch with the rest of the Christian world.

The Episcopal Church has always been in close relation and contact with Protestantism. Her easily misunderstood name is a curious evidence of this. She includes, and has always included, in her fold many who have strong Protestant tendencies and sympathies. She receives constant accessions from the ranks of Protestantism, and some of those who enter her communion retain much of their old point of view. She has many interests and aims in common with Protestantism, and is brought into frequent and valued association with its leaders and representatives. Still more, she holds in common with orthodox Protestants many of the great cardinal doctrines of the Christian Faith, and above all else is joined with them in belief in Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. The life of the Episcopal Church has been much influenced by her contact with Protestantism. She recognizes fully and gladly the truths for which it stands. She does not believe that its struggle and its witness in the world have been without meaning. She knows that it has played a great part in the spiritual development of this country. She honours, and claims to share in, its love of freedom, its sense of personal responsibility, its loyalty to reason and conscience, its profound reverence for the authority of Scripture, its concern for direct relation between each individual soul and God.

The Episcopal Church stands in a relation of warm and living touch and of fellowship at many points with Protestantism. But her own faith and order as judged by the standards of the undivided Church are fundamentally and definitely Catholic. Her distinctive beliefs are those which have been held and taught by the Catholic Church throughout the world since the Apostles' days. She has inherited these through nineteen centuries of history.

In common with all the ancient Communions everywhere, both East and West, the Protestant Episcopal Church holds that the Church in its outward and visible organization, as well as in its inward life, is of Divine institution. With St. Paul she believes that the Church is the visible Body of which Christ is the invisible and living Head. The belief of the Episcopal Church, as officially set forth, and on every page assumed, in her Prayer Book, is that Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself established His Church in this world to be the organ and means of His continued life and work among men. She holds that all who are baptized into Him and are thus made sharers of His life, are members of this one Church which is His Body. Whether they realize this or not, even though they disbelieve it, and deny it, she holds that all who are baptized into Christ are members of His Church, and she does not hold nor believe that there can be any Church other than that visible society which Christ Himself created and which, in so far as it is true to itself and to its Head, is, and must in its very nature be, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. The New Testament knows nothing of "Churches", except as these were local parts, particular congregations, of the one Church. The Episcopal Church therefore does not believe that there ought to be, or that there can be, separate Churches of men's making; she believes only in the one Church, which is Christ's own Body, in which He lives, and through which He still speaks and acts.

Again in common with all the ancient Communions, including at least three-fourths of all Christendom, the Episcopal Church believes that when Our Lord founded His Church in this world, He Himself appointed a self-perpetuating Ministry, and that this Ministry has come down to the present time through the succession of the Bishops. The Episcopal Church holds the Catholic doctrine that a Priest, ordained by a Bishop, in direct succession from the Apostles, is indispensably necessary

for the Celebration of the Holy Communion, the central and characteristic act of the Christian Church. She pronounces no judgment as to the efficacy of sacred ordinances otherwise administered. But she holds herself bound wholly to the ancient ways which she believes to be of God's own appointment. That this is the belief of the Episcopal Church is made unmistakably clear in the Preface to her Ordinal. Her solemn and official declaration is that "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests and Deacons", and that "to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he . . . hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination". And that which she declares in word she carries out in her acts. That she herself holds her doctrine of the Priesthood to be Catholic is sufficiently demonstrated by one simple fact. A Priest of the Roman Catholic Church, of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, or of any Catholic Communion, coming into her fold, is not re-ordained, while on the other hand, no Minister of any Protestant Communion, however great his attainments, or holy his life, can under any circumstances be admitted to the Ministry of the Episcopal Church, and allowed to celebrate the Holy Communion, without ordination to the Priesthood, at the hands of a Bishop. The doctrine of the Priesthood in the Episcopal Church is not, as is sometimes supposed by those not familiar with her teachings, a mere opinion or view held only by the "High Church party". It is a matter of the Church's own most distinct and essential teaching, as appears in her authoritative formularies. If any member of the Episcopal Church, clergyman or layman, does not believe in the office of the Priesthood, and that

Episcopal ordination is necessary for the exercise of the functions of the Priesthood, he in so far fails to accept the teaching and to represent the position of his own Communion. Whatever his individual views may be, he must, in his official acts, conform and give assent to this doctrine. This doctrine of the Priesthood and the Sacraments stands for, and is the outward expression of, that which is most fundamental of all things in the Christian Religion. It stands for the true "givenness" of all that comes to us in Christ, for the present operation of Divine grace on the souls of men, for the reality of the supernatural. History seems to us to show that this doctrine is the great safeguard of the faith. We see that where men have held to this belief, they hold fast to the certainty of God's revelation contained in the Catholic Creeds, and believe firmly in the crucial facts of the Virgin Birth and the Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord. In her doctrine of the Church and the Priesthood, the Anglican Communion aligns herself with Catholic Christendom, and it is this fact which makes it impossible for the Episcopal Church, without surrender of fundamental principle, to identify herself with the present movement for Protestant Federation in America or to enter into United Protestant work in the Mission fields or elsewhere. The Episcopal Church should feel, and does feel, warm sympathy with these movements. She should join in thanksgiving for them as most hopeful expressions of a growing desire for reunion, and as important steps in this direction. She ought in every right way to manifest her sympathy with these efforts, and to show that she wishes them Godspeed, but she can not officially participate in, and commit herself to, them without being untrue to the opportunity that God seems to have given her in relation to the Christian world as a whole, and denial of her own essential faith.

It is a sign of growth in the spirit which must prepare the way for reunion that, with singular breadth of view,

some of the most trusted Protestant leaders show a real and sympathetic understanding of the position of the Episcopal Church. There could hardly be a better example of this than that given by the Reverend Arthur Judson Brown, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, in his recent volume, in which after expressing his hearty agreement with Bishop Montgomery that we do not want to reduce our convictions to "a least common denominator of Christianity", he adds:

"Meantime, those of us who are not Anglicans should do that justice to their principles which we expect them to do to ours. The Anglicans have a noble vision of the union of the people of God, a union which is to include all the historic branches of the Christian Church—Protestant, Roman and Greek. For that union they ardently hope and earnestly pray. . . . They seem unyielding to Non-Conformists because they feel that any impairment of their position to suit a particular communion on one side would jeopardize to that extent the ultimate acceptability of their position to communions on the other side, and that they have no alternative but to adhere to their Church through good and evil report, confident that in time the scattered and separate groups of Christians will find in that Church either their common point of rally and reunion or a principle of historic continuity that will be an indispensable contribution to the Church of the future. . . . And while we may not share the conviction of many Anglicans that it will come on the basis of their Church, we are not prepared to hold aloof from them because they adhere with unflinching fidelity to the Church which they reverently believe is called of God to be the unifying principle of a divided Christendom. Let us rather work with them wherever we can, honouring their loyalty to their faith as we expect them to honour ours, and joyfully believing that the Spirit of God will in His own way and time bring us all to the desired haven of Christian fellowship."[1]

Such words are a happy illustration of the comprehensive spirit in which the questions relating to unity are now being considered.

Anglicans, however, are far from holding that Christian reunion can come only "on the basis of their Church". They do not hold or feel that their own Communion rises to the full ideal of Catholicity. The Episcopal Church does not desire to see all Christians made into "Protestant Episcopalians". What the Anglican Communion desires

[1] *Unity and Missions*, pages 223, 224.

and prays for is that in God's own way she may, together with all Communions, be lifted up into a realization and manifestation of the unity that is in Christ, fuller, holier, more Catholic, than is now seen in any Communion in the world. And to this end the Episcopal Church believes that it is her duty, and that of all other Communions likewise to hold in faithful trust those principles which they believe to be essential and which they regard as vital to Christianity.

Christians of all names should unite, as fully as possible, in practical and social work. This involves no compromise of principle or conviction. If the movement for Protestant Federation related only to forms of civic and social endeavour, it would present no difficulty. But its work is not limited to this sphere. Its prospectus states clearly and specifically that its purpose includes union in religious work.

Its aim is to combine the Protestant Churches and to bring about as far as this is possible a "United Protestantism".

Quite naturally, therefore, its platform embodies and bases itself upon the Protestant principle as to the Church and the Ministry. To this principle it is explicitly and definitely committed. The doctrine of "the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America", upon which the Federation movement is founded, cannot possibly be reconciled with what the Episcopal Church believes to be the teaching of the New Testament, and of our Lord Himself, in regard to His Church.

From this doctrine of the essential oneness of all "the Churches", upon which the Federation platform is built, it follows indisputably, just as the Protestant Communions which are united in the movement believe, that an Episcopally ordained Ministry is unessential, and that the faith of the ancient, undivided Church with regard to the priesthood is a mistake, and official acceptance of the platform signifies endorsement of this position.

The facts here set forth involve no criticism of the platform as such, nor do they furnish any argument against the Federation of Protestant Communions. For them the platform calls for no sacrifice of principle. But it is clear that no Communion which holds the ancient doctrine of the Ministry and Sacraments can, without surrender of faith, commit itself to the Federation Movement.

The Episcopal Church can not rightly be expected to enter into Federated union in religious work on a platform which presupposes and assumes that the doctrine which she holds as to the Church, the Priesthood and the Sacraments is not only unessential but untrue.

There are many ways in which Catholics, Protestants, Jews and all others can unite and co-operate to their own benefit, and to the great advantage of the community. But plainly they can not, without sacrifice of conviction, unite in the ministration and propagation of the Christian religion.

Before there can be union in religious work, there must be agreement as to the essentials of faith. Without this an outward reunion would not be a manifestation of unity. It would probably be a manifestation of the view that belief is of no importance, and of an absence of any definite faith whatever.

It is natural however that the Protestant Communions should form Federations and enter into united religious work. In many cases the differences between these Communions are recognized by themselves to be only of minor importance. There seems to be every reason why Communions which are practically indistinguishable should so unite. For the Protestant Communions Federation may prove, and we pray that it will prove, to be a great gain. But for the Episcopal Church, under present conditions, and until much further progress towards a true unity shall have been achieved, it would be something far more serious than a mistake.

If the Episcopal Church were to adopt the principle on which Federation in this country is based, and on which

union of religious work in the Mission fields is proposed, she would cut herself off from the fellowship of the Anglican Communion, she would destroy all prospect of her nearer approach to the rest of the Catholic world, she would cast away the hope that God has given her of helping to mediate between, and draw nearer together, the great separated parts of Christendom, Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant, and she would surrender that which she believes that she has received from Jesus Christ in trust not only for herself but for her Protestant brethren, which she believes that they will one day rejoice to claim as their own, and which many of the wisest and most devout among them today would grieve to see her depart from, or treat lightly.

The principle which must govern all our actions in regard to co-operation and union with others in religious work was set forth by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at the last Lambeth Conference in the following carefully drawn resolution:

"This Conference reaffirms the resolution of the Conference of 1897 that 'Every opportunity should be taken to emphasize the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation'. It desires further to affirm that in all partial projects for reunion and inter-communion the final attainment of the Divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it."

And the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his recent statement with reference to the Kikuyu controversy, a statement the great moderation of which no one has questioned, says:

"If for the sake of securing what looks like a gain in the direction of Church Unity, or of attaining in the Mission field a nearer prospect of a Church in the true sense 'native' we were to treat the question of a threefold ministry as trifling or negligible, it is obvious that we might do irreparable ill to the future life of the Church of Christ in that region of the earth."

Looking at the matter only from the practical point of view, any action on the part of the Anglican Communion

or of the Episcopal Church which would tend to impair or obscure its historic position as to the Ministry and Sacraments would show a short-sightedness, and a lack of statesmanlike vision strange indeed. It could be explained only on the assumption that we had come to believe in nothing more than a United Protestantism and had no real hope or desire for the reunion of Christendom.

The belief as to the Church and the Ministry which the Episcopal Church holds is that which was held by the whole Christian world for fifteen centuries and which is held by three-fourths of the whole Christian world today. Clearly it would be as mistaken in policy, as it would be wrong in principle, for the Episcopal Church in this matter of her fundamental belief to abandon the position of the majority in order to align herself with the minority, and that a very greatly divided minority.

Whatever the difficulties and obstacles, whether the prospect is encouraging or discouraging, the ideal of the Episcopal Church must for ever be the ultimate reunion of all Christendom.

In all her prayers and plans and efforts, she must have this ideal ever in view. All that she undertakes must be in conformity with this final aim. She can not even entertain the suggestion that because such reunion seems far off she may cease to believe in it and strive for it.

She must welcome any and every step which makes truly in this direction but she must try every proposed measure by the touchstone of this her abiding faith and hope.

She can do nothing for the sake of a seeming temporary gain which would weaken her central position, or lessen her power to help towards the realization of this ultimate ideal, because she believes that this, and this alone, is in accordance with the prayer and the purpose of the Church's Divine Head.

The Episcopal Church has placed herself officially on record through her General Convention, as believing that

it will be a true step forward if Christians can be brought to consider together fully and frankly, but in the spirit of love and forbearance, the things as to which they are not agreed. With the conviction that the true approach towards reunion is to be made not by ignoring or minimizing real differences but by honest effort, with the help of God's grace, to face and deal with them and, believing that "the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order", she has ventured to suggest the calling of a World Conference and to ask that all Christian Communions throughout the world, which confess Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, will unite in arranging for and conducting such a Conference.

To some this method may seem a slow one. But in efforts towards Christian reunion there can be no place for haste or impatience. God alone is able to bring this to pass and He awaits our readiness to yield ourselves to His Will and to the guidance of His Spirit. The fact that this method is slow is perhaps one of its chief recommendations. We must not try to run ahead of grace. And the way of Conference would seem to be the only one that is now open to us. How else, so far as we can see, can there be advance towards deeper mutual understanding and closer agreement except through consideration and brotherly discussion of the matters that divide us.

We are sometimes asked what the Episcopal Church is prepared to concede, as though this were a necessary preliminary to Conference. The answer is that no Communion is asked to say whether it will concede anything. All are asked simply to confer. The purpose of meeting in this way is to understand more fully the position of those from whom we differ, to enter more clearly into what others think, what their convictions are, on what grounds they hold them and why they feel them to be of vital importance. In a Conference men come to-

gether not to argue but to explain, and if possible to make more clear their positions to each other.

If concessions are to be made by any, these would naturally come after the gathering, as a result of it, and not before it. It has in fact been agreed by all from the beginning that in connection with the World Conference there should be no discussion of points of difference until the gathering itself meets.

We hope that when the time comes, the Episcopal Church will be found ready, for the sake of reunion, to concede everything that can rightly be conceded. But she can not concede anything believed by her to be a matter of principle or an essential part of God's revelation of Truth, nor would she desire to see any other Communion do so. We should no more think it right that others should do this than that we should do it ourselves.

Concession, whether by individuals or by Communions, is morally justifiable only in matters which are seen to be non-essential. No one has the right to sacrifice a real conviction for the sake of fuller intercourse or closer fellowship.

The true manifestation of unity can not be brought about by concession, on either hand, of that which is believed to be essential. The way toward reunion must be prepared by fuller faith, truer sympathy, and growth in the knowledge and spirit of Christ our Lord. Reunion in Him will come not by surrender of the truth, or of that which is believed to be such, but by deeper entrance into the truth, under the guidance of God's spirit, so that all may progress toward a common mind.

In this growth of sympathy and understanding direct personal contact, human fellowship, is a most important factor, and it is the opportunity which it provides for such contact, through the years of preparation as well as at the gathering itself, which seems to constitute one great value of the method of Conference.

The Conference is suggested in the hope and belief that truer understanding of divergent views may lessen some of the difficulties and remove others entirely. It is believed that, at least in some cases, candid and loving consideration will show that those who seemed furthest away from us in belief are nearer than we thought, that they are emphasizing a part of the truth of which we had in some measure lost sight, or a principle which we need more to emphasize. We do not pretend to know how the different principles can be reconciled. But we do know that God is able to do that which is far beyond our power or knowledge, and we believe that such an effort as this is according to His Will.

It is definitely provided that no Communion can be in any way compromised by the presence of its representatives at the Conference. It is to have no legislative powers of any sort. It is not the business of the Conference to arrange terms or to formulate definite plans of reunion between separated Communions. Any such action could be undertaken only by the Communions themselves. The aim of the Conference would be to inspire and prepare the way for action. It is to be only a Conference on Faith and Order looking towards Christian reunion, and in its carefully restricted scope perhaps lies its hope of service. Certainly no principles can be impaired or compromised by participation in a Conference at which each Communion, through its own chosen representatives, shall have full opportunity, without limitation and with the assurance of patient and sympathetic hearing, to present to all who are assembled the truth which it holds and believes.

The fact that such a Conference, to include the whole Christian world, Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant, can be seriously considered is in itself epoch marking and it shows that we are progressing on the road towards reunion. It is the first time since the separations of the sixteenth century that there has been such a proposal to bring together Christians from all Communions, with the

thought of reunion in their hearts and prayers, on the basis of belief in the Godhead of their Common Saviour. It is at least encouraging that after centuries of estrangement and division Christian men should now be planning to come together for face to face consideration of the things which have separated them, not to sacrifice conviction, but to speak the truth faithfully to each other in love with the hope of finding the way to closer fellowship.

Who shall measure the moral and spiritual influence of such a gathering, its effect upon the minds, the imagination and the faith of men, or the results that may flow from it?

The difficulties in the way of bringing about a World Conference of this character are manifest, but the progress so far made has been greater than the most sanguine would have dared to anticipate five years ago when the proposal was made. Already more than fifty Religious Communions in all parts of the world, including the Anglican Communion in its various branches, have identified themselves with the undertaking, and have appointed Commissions or Committees to represent them.

Assurances of support for the movement have been received from high dignitaries of the Eastern Churches and the matter is under favourable discussion in the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia. The proposal has also received the warm commendation of many eminent dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, and, through the Papal Secretary, Cardinal Gasparri, His Holiness, Pope Benedict XV has recently expressed his personal interest in it with the assurance of his prayers for the right guidance of the undertaking and for its prosperous issue.

At the precise moment when the present war broke out, a deputation was about to start from this country to lay the matter formally before the authorities of the Churches in Europe and the East. This mission has only been deferred, and it is to be carried into effect just as soon as the conditions admit of it.

It seemed at first as though the breaking out of the war were an almost fatal blow to the hopes for the World Conference. In God's ordering it may prove to have been far otherwise. As a result of the fearful experience through which the world is passing men may be more ready to listen to suggestions of this nature. Out of the great struggle may come forces making powerfully for closer union and concord. With all its horrors the war seems to be bringing the world into closer relation. It is opening doors, casting down barriers and drawing the ends of the earth together. On the whole we may believe that it is making towards world-brotherhood. It has compelled men to see more clearly than ever the weakness and ineffectiveness of a Christianity disunited, and divided against itself. It is suggesting to many the relation of a United Christendom to the hope of a lasting world peace. It is bringing men to see that the only real hope of peace for the world is in the religion of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. May not one result of the war be an opportunity without precedent in history for some such effort, some such coming together of the Christian forces, as the World Conference movement proposes?

And may not all Christians of whatever name be rightly asked to pray, at their Masses and at their Prayer Meetings, for God's guidance and blessing for this effort which has as its only object the drawing into closer contact and understanding of all who believe in and love the Lord Jesus Christ, and the bringing somewhat nearer of that unity for which He Himself prayed, and still prays, the need of which was never so tragically manifest as it is now?

The Nature of Catholicism As It Appears to Protestants

By Lic. Hermann Mulert,
Lecturer in the University of Berlin.

I

Progress in scientific knowledge in Church and State, Economics and School is not always at once followed by the changes which should bring practice into harmony with the new acquisition. It can not be otherwise, for man thinks quicker than he acts, and regulations for the masses must always be of a more constant nature than the ideas of the individual. It often, however, happens that practice follows too haltingly on the steps of progress in knowledge. With regard to Protestant religious instruction on the subject of the distinctive teaching of the different Christian Churches this was for a long time admittedly the case and is even now partly so.

Whether similar faults are made on the part of Catholics I am hardly in a position to judge. Even if a German Protestant is acquainted with a comparatively large number of Catholic religious text-books, he must still be cautious in judging whether in oral teaching Protestantism is represented to young Catholics in a light which corresponds with the suggestions contained in the text-books. He will—as he values a mutual understanding in religious matters—be anxious that his Catholic compatriots should be given an accurate and impartial view of Protestantism; because for the devout and zealous Catholic, who has grown up with certain strong simple religious sentiments, it will from the nature

of the case not be easy to obtain a correct impression of Protestantism, since these thoughts and feelings, unquestioned by Catholics, are lacking for Protestants. Protestantism, too, takes so many shapes that the Catholic may easily conclude that it is in a perpetual flux, is altogether intangible. It is, in the end, easier for the Protestant, however new the study may be to him, to learn to understand something of the fundamental sentiments of a Catholic, and from that point advance towards a comprehension of the Catholic system. The task in this branch of religious instruction of Catholics is not an easy one to accomplish. What is done shall not be discussed here. We will rather try to determine how the corresponding case is met on the part of Protestants.

Unfortunately sometimes, in Protestant religious lessons in elementary, higher schools, and similar institutions, the relations of Catholicism and Protestantism to each other are treated on the old basis of controverted doctrinal points (*Unterscheidungslehren*). Thereby the idea is developed that Catholics and Protestants are, or at least should be, agreed on some points, that on others they differ, and must do so in accordance with the teaching of their Church.

Starting from this point, Melanchthon could so compose his *Augustana* that it could and should awaken among his opponents the impression that in all essentials Lutherans were really at one with Catholics (art. 21). Starting, too, from this point, Calixtus could strive for a union of the Churches based on the common doctrines which prevailed in the Christian Church during the first five centuries and which were accepted by all. The veneration with which the Apostles' Creed is regarded in wide Protestant circles rests in no small degree on the conviction that it is a bond of union with devout Catholics. For instance, it expressly forms for the "German Society of the Nobility", which embraces

Catholics and Protestants, the foundation on which its statutes rest. One often hears Protestants of a conservative bent say, "I have more in common with a believing Catholic than with a Protestant who denies Christ." This conviction has its important political result. It serves as the motive in political elections in Germany and the Netherlands for the co-operation of Protestants of a conservative tendency in matters political and ecclesiastical with political Catholicism against Liberalism. This view was perhaps expressed most emphatically by Kahnis, the Leipzig theologian (died 1888), one of the leaders of the new strict Lutheran School in Germany during the last century, when he declared (*Die Sache der lutherischen Kirche gegenüber der Union*, 1854, page 91) that believing Protestants could co-operate with good Catholics sooner than with the advocates of radical-critical views in the Protestant Church, because the latter denied almost all the doctrines of the Protestant Faith, while the former accepted them "with a plus" (*nur ein plus haben*)—their belief went further.

Luther was of another opinion. Or, in more guarded terms, he was not always of this opinion, but rather he often rejected it with characteristic energy, most emphatically perhaps in one case, of which we still have evidence. His manuscript of the *Schmalkaldischen Artikel* is preserved in the library at Heidelberg. In it he treated first "The Grand Articles of the Divine Majesty": the Doctrines of the Trinity and of Salvation according to the Apostles' Creed, and concluded this section of the work with the words, "these articles are not the subject of dispute or quarrel, for we both (*i. e.* we, as well as the adherents of the Pope) believe and confess them". But then he drew a heavy stroke through "believe and" (Compare Thieme's *Luther's Testimony against Rome* [*Testament wider Rom*], 1900 p. 14), and so the printed text reads "for we both con-

fess them" (*cum illos utrinque confiteamur*). Therefore while Catholics, as has a thousand times been shown, confess these truths with us, it does not, according to Luther, necessarily follow that they share our belief in them. Certainly he did not intend to say that their confession is a farce; though he may have found the frequently worldly-minded prelates at the court of the Pope to be dissemblers, yet he also knew pious Catholics, and in those days the sincerity of the assent of all devout Catholics to these doctrines was as little questioned as it is today.

But this assent is not what Luther calls belief and what in his opinion should alone be dignified by this term. If succeeding Lutheran dogmatists have drawn a distinction between this "*assensus*" (naturally assuming it to include a knowledge of Christian doctrine, of facts of salvation [*Heilstatsachen*]) and "*fiducia*" (such a trust in God as fills the heart and rules the life), it follows that so long as all three of these (*notitia*, *assensus*, *fiducia*) are not in existence, the presence of the two first should be recognized as relatively precious, —something is better than nothing. Luther thought otherwise. His opinion of such a mere assent of the intellect was: *est haec fides valde perniciosa, quam satius esset non habere;* that is, this sort of belief is very pernicious, that it were better not to have it (see the big *Latin Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, and *Erlanger Edition*, vol. 15, pp. 301-2). Atheism were better than such "Belief"? How does Luther come to make this surprisingly sharp utterance? We shall be guilty of no inadmissible modernizing, if we read it so: in better case than the man who believes he holds the true faith, but whose heart and life have not been renewed through the teaching of the Christian Church, is the honest doubter; the former thinks he has won all and is yet far from God, while the latter, sincerely seeking after God, may perhaps find him.

The Catholic Church, in decided contradiction to Luther's emphasis of "*fiducia*", declares that the obedient acceptation of the doctrines of the Church is in itself an act of religious value. Faith, with the Catholic, is in the first place and essentially the obedient reception of all that his Church teaches. If the Protestant ever designates this by the term "belief" or "faith", the fact must, at any rate according to Luther's opinion, be emphasized that, as far as we and the Catholics share the same "belief", we do not share it in the same sense. If *what* we believe is on the whole the same, the belief itself is of a different nature.

Every statement, therefore, of the relations of Catholicism and Protestantism to each other based on their controverted doctrinal points (*Unterscheidungslehre*) is misleading. Before the treatment of all other doctrinal distinctions the above-mentioned fundamental difference must rather be characterized; before a statement of the differences of doctrines must come that of "belief" or "faith". A remodelling of the traditional plan then follows, which is accompanied by the collapse of the ecclesiastical-political inferences, which, in the interest of a reconciliation and union of the two Churches, had been drawn from the fact that the number and importance of the doctrines accepted by both Churches alike was considerable. It will nevertheless, in a certain sense, remain an enumeration of "controverted doctrines", for differences in devotional sentiments, in worship, in Church government, make themselves felt in dogma and theology. Everything can not here be theoretically, comprehensively, grasped and systematized; many a shade of difference in practice and reality can solely be treated as such; it is accepted unquestioned; it has always been recognized.

And the treatment of the differences between the Churches will always retain something of the character of an enumeration, when in treating discrepancies of

doctrine all can not be traced back to a fundamental principle. In the teaching of every Church some points stand irrationally side by side, although not accidentally in an inferior sense; psychological, historical associations may rule here, where all can not be forced into a logical system.

II

Assertions have perhaps already been made, the accuracy of which can only be proved by the attempt which we now make to grasp the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism, the nature of Catholicism as it appears to the Protestant; using a different method to the above-mentioned faulty one based on controverted doctrines, which school-books show us to be still the customary one.

In discussing the nature of Catholicism as it appears to the Protestant we shall leave out of consideration the distinctions between the various Protestant Churches, such as Lutheranism, Calvinism, etc. The task would be an impossible one if we had to treat the single Protestant thoughts as opposed to the Catholic thoughts. Whoever desires this must from within the bounds of Protestantism start from Lutheranism or Calvinism, from among the adherents of one of the various forms of Church government, from a more orthodox or more critical theology; or he must be able to justify his conciliatory and broadminded attitude if he strives for adjustment and recognizes several different points of view side by side as characteristic of Protestantism. For us this is unnecessary as we have to treat but one side of the matter, the nature of Catholicism, and leave to the Protestant teacher the question as to how he will formulate one by one the points of antithesis as he becomes conscious of them. With regard to divergences between the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches, much of what is here said may apply to the Church of

the East; the one to which we shall, however, chiefly refer will be the Church of Rome. But finally, is not Catholicism to be met with on Protestant ground, just as evangelical, Protestant features are to be found within the Catholic Churches? Does not the episcopal form of Church organization of some of the Churches, which in the course of the Reformation of the sixteenth century freed themselves from the Pope, seem to many a Protestant to savour of Catholicism? Do not members of these Churches, especially those of the Church of England, openly confess such Catholicism? And where even this is not the case, are not many Protestants reproached by members of their own Churches for being Catholic in holding or defending some religious idea, rite or usage? Sohm, the celebrated Protestant jurist of Leipzig, says in his *Kirchengeschichte* (10th edition, 1896, p. 30) "the natural man is a born Catholic". And it is certain that in each of us "the natural man" is still very strong. Otto Baumgarten writes "most Protestants are Catholic" (*Predigt-Probleme*, 1904, p. 16). Can we then believe it possible to draw Catholicism with clear outlines?

We find that here too Idea and Phenomenon (*Idee und Erscheinung*), Principle and Fact, Intellectual Current and Organization, which result the one from the other and serve the one to effectuate the other, do not correspond. On the one hand, all in the Catholic Churches is not "Catholic"; on the other, Catholicism as an ideal is to be found also outside these Churches. This applies also to other confessions; the same may be said of all branches of intellectual life; their names are chosen *a parte potiori*. The Protestant reader will be able to decide for himself whether, instead of feeling contrasts, what is here shown to be Catholic appeals to him, and if so, how far that is the case, and the Catholic whether the description of Catholicism as it is given meets with his approval or is rejected by him. I can not

here produce proofs that what are here described are really the ruling thoughts, emotions, rules of order in the Roman Catholic Church, for that would unduly enlarge the limits of this essay; the theologian will have such proofs at hand. Whether the statement as a whole is accurate and intelligible, the reader will at the conclusion be able to judge.

To indicate one thought, one sentiment, or one special point from which all the rest of necessity follows, naturally appears to be the most important aim of all efforts to arrive at an understanding of Catholicism, and the best reward for all such efforts. It has already been hinted that it is doubtful whether in this sense a fundamental idea in Catholicism can be produced; yet this has again and again been attempted. Wilhelm Koch, Professor of Catholic Theology in Tübingen, has with O. Wecker published valuable lectures on Catholicism and Christianity (1910. The book, which appeared in print with episcopal approval, was placed on the Index, and a new, slightly revised edition appeared in the same year). In this work Catholicism is represented as the Religion of Authority. There is certainly truth in this; it makes the power of the Catholic Church over the soul of man clearer to us, for how many people long for support, guidance, authorities. Is it not expressly in the nature of religion that man should feel his need of support, his dependence, that he should submit to superior powers? So Catholicism, according to the above definition, appears to be a system that perfectly satisfies religious instincts.

We shall, however, be better able to do justice to Catholicism if we look at it in a different light. If we take it as the religion of authority, we can well understand that the masses of those who are intellectually less independent confess it; we can equally well understand that progressive minds come into conflict with Rome, with the authority of this Church; but it is less

clear to us, that highly educated people, who are known as independent thinkers on other subjects, submit blindly to the demands and judgments of the priests in everything connected with religion. But this Catholicism of the mature, this obedience of the educated classes becomes easier to understand when, instead of speaking of the Religion of Authority, we rather define Catholicism as the Religion of Fellowship, the Ecclesiastical Religion, the Religion of the Church (*kirchliche Religion, Kirchenreligion*). The Catholic highly values the Communion of Faith; it gives him confidence and strength to know that innumerable thousands confess the same faith, that they with him form one Church, existing throughout the whole world, in all lands, and through all ages, one Holy Catholic, that is, universal Church; this thought fills him with deep veneration and holy joy. Some Protestant Christians also are conscious of this feeling, and have consequently little sympathy for breaches and divisions in the Church. Of this every English and American Christian will be able to produce numerous examples. The following is one from Germany. Some years ago a venerable nobleman, who was deeply interested in Church matters, took much pains to work out a plan for divine service according to which, throughout Protestant Germany, the same text, the same liturgy and even the same hymns should be used. For him and those with similar feelings the thought was evidently one of great value that the hymn which is now being sung is rising to heaven from all the Protestant churches in the land, from the cathedral in Schleswig, from the Minster at Ulm, from St. Paul's Church in Frankfort, as well as from the humblest meeting-house of a Polish village in the east of Germany. Others will be quite indifferent to such uniformity; on the contrary, they appreciate liberty in this respect as a sign of rich life.

The Catholic has in a strong measure a feeling for the value of unity, not only in Faith, but also in Ritual,

in the constitution of the organized Church; and, in conversation with us, Catholics often complain bitterly of the divisions brought about by Luther. For 1500 years the Church remained one and the same. Then came the monk of Wittenberg who destroyed this unity. Was that necessary? Even though we understand and respect the pain expressed in such words, we Protestants must answer, "It was not right that the Church should have remained one and the same for 1500 years; from Jesus to Julius II or Leo X, from Paul to Biel or Jimenez or even to Innocent III, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus was a long way, and not only was the distance great, but the Church of Scholasticism and of the Popes of the Renaissance had so far lost touch with the fishermen and publicans of Galilee, that other times, places and cultural conditions did not suffice to explain the changes which had crept in; it was in fact a case of religious degeneration." The Roman Catholic does not admit this; if he does confess that his Church through its human representatives shows imperfections, the above-mentioned change does not appear to him as a whole to be a decline but a stage of development under divine guidance. The constancy and immutability of Church tradition are for him at once objects of desire, confidence, and joy. Belief is for him (one may almost say primarily) belief in the Communion of Saints, founded by God in Christ and directed by the Holy Spirit. We Protestants are in the habit of drawing a distinction between Religion and the Church. We say that the Church is an organization for the propagation of Religion, and therefore that Religion has precedence of the Church, as we consider the end superior to the means. This distinction is for the Catholic incomprehensible. Religion and the Church are for him, generally speaking, one. Religion without the pale of the Church, his Church, the Catholic Church, can in his estimation be but false Religion. God is

to be found in this Church alone, whoever seeks true Religion must come to the Catholic Church. In principle these thoughts are always held fast. It is a matter of satisfaction that practical concessions are made for the sake of toleration, that all the hard consequences are not drawn from the old dictum "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" in so far that Catholics sometimes recognize in non-Catholics a feeling of inner fellowship with the Catholic Church or an inclination towards it. But this in no way alters the fundamental character of Catholicism.

We need not remind the theologian that the fundamental character of Catholicism is not described in this light for the first time here. One of the best known statements of the nature of Catholicism of former years is contained in Schleiermacher's *Der christliche Glaube* (2d edition, § 24), in which he sums up the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism as follows: "Catholicism makes the relations of the individual to Christ dependent on his relations to the Church; Protestantism, the relations of the individual to the Church dependent on his relations to Christ." In our day we find Sell (*Catholicismus und Protestantismus*, 1908, p. 125) writing "where the Church stands in Catholicism, Faith (of the individual) stands in Protestantism", which utterance caused Theodor Kaftan to protest, saying that where the Church stands in Catholicism, Protestantism places Christ (*Reden und Vorträge bei der 23. Generalversammlung des Evangelischen Bundes zu Chemnitz*, 1910, p. 118). It appears to me that both Kaftan and Sell are right in their way. While Luther maintains that the Protestant may come to Christ (or through Christ to God) by Faith without human mediation, Catholicism declares that the primary object of Faith and Obedience is the Church. We may say that the Protestant accepts Christ, or that he accepts Christ in Faith, and accordingly as we lay stress on the

words "Christ" or "Faith" it will follow that Catholicism puts the Church in the place of the one or the other. For the Catholic the Church is an Object of Faith and a mediator of Faith.

III

The recognition of the fact that Catholicism is essentially an ecclesiastical Religion leads us to two further characteristics. Firstly, that it must lay the greatest stress on the importance of the organization of the Church. Canon Law is pronounced to be holy, divine, necessary to salvation.

The Church is as much a legal institution as the State. It is, to repeat the words of Bellarmine, a *coetus hominum ita visibilis et palpabilis, ut est coetus populi Romani vel regnum Galliae aut respublica Venetorum*— a society of people, as visible and palpable as the citizens of Rome, the kingdom of France or the republic of Venice. The distinction between visible and invisible Church, to which we are accustomed, is not made by Catholics. By "invisible Church" we understand the communion of truly devout, God-fearing Christians, and we are convinced that such are to be found within the various Churches. But since, as we have seen, true religion according to the teaching of the Catholic Church can only be found within that Church, we must not here apply our conception of the Invisible Church. That would be equal to saying that true Religion is to be found only in communion with those who have true Religion, which is tautology, senseless. But the rigid Catholic believes that true Christianity exists in his Church alone, in that institution which is known as the Roman Catholic Church, this visible, tangible, legally constituted, statelike body. It is tangible, visible in the sense that it is possible to say exactly who belongs to it. Should a dispute arise on the subject of membership, the officials of the Church, the Priests, Bishops,

the Pope, are there to give a legal decision. It will not be denied that there are in this Church unworthy members, that there are unworthy priests, as there have been unworthy Popes. But as no larger organization can make the legality of the acts of its officials dependent on the personal qualities of these men, but associates this legality with the compliance with certain outward forms, so the Catholic Church, for instance in the struggle against Donatism, settled that its sanctity and the certainty of salvation which it promises do not depend on the worthiness of the priests as individuals. The presence in the Church of laymen of unchristianlike character has still less power to rob the Church of its dignity and curtail the blessings it confesses. If the ecclesiastical officials, the priests, officiate according to the canons of the Church, the Church will fulfil its mission of salvation to many. That single individuals should through their own fault be lost is felt to be of minor importance compared to the existence of a divine Canon Law and to the prescribed Services of God-elected Priests and Bishops. All depends on this canonical law, this polity of the Church. Sohm gives but two sides of one and the same case, when in his *Kirchenrecht* (I., 1892) and in similar works (*Wesen und Ursprung des Catholicismus*, 2d Ed., 1912), he sometimes emphasizes the fact that the recognition of a divine canonical law, of a system of ecclesiastical law as necessary to salvation, is characteristic of Catholicism, and again sees the nature of Catholicism determined by its placing on the same level an empirical fellowship with the true Church of Christ, the Church in the sense of Faith. If a certain system of law is necessary to salvation, the Church alone which possesses this system can be the true Church of Christ, and if an empirical Church is identified with the true Church of Christ, it becomes necessary to define the limits of membership to this empirical Church, which can only

be done by means of fixed canonical laws. We need not here go into the more historical questions which are subjects of dispute between Sohm and other investigators of the polity of the ancient Christian Church, especially Harnack. No one disputes how important it is in entering into the spirit of Catholicism to be clear as to the prominent position which Canon Law here has in religious life. Luther showed indifference for the constitution of the Church, for him the preaching of the Gospel was all important. The Catholic regards the organization of his Church by no means with indifference. Even the institution of Priests, Bishops, a Pope, is for him a divine institution, which he traces back to Christ, and canonical law, even in those points which as *juris humani* can lay no immediate claim to divine appointment, is holy. On the one hand canons are holy doctrines, on the other, ecclesiastical doctrine claims obedience as much as the canons. Canonical law is Dogma, and Dogma has the force of law.

Herein lies our next point, which immediately results from the fact that Catholicism is a religion of Fellowship, a Church Religion, and which was emphasized by W. Koch, when he wrote, Catholicism is the religion of Authority and Subordination. Not outward subordination alone; with such the law that achieves its ends by force against opposition must perhaps be satisfied: but reverent obedience to the community to which one belongs, loving submission in opinion and will to others, to the brethren. Religious Fellowship is in some sense valued by every devout person, but when differences on the subject of conviction arise between the community and individuals, the question is, shall the individual yield to the authority of the community or remain true to his conviction and run the risk of isolation. Luther would have had the courage to go on his way alone; he went before without knowing how many would follow him. But with thousands, with

the mass of Catholics, the leaning towards fellowship, the need of support is stronger, it wins the day; the more surely that such subordination has proved meritorious to their forefathers through the ages, such a spiritual tendency transmits itself and in time becomes more pronounced.

In wide Catholic circles the authority of the priest rests less on the fact that he is the preacher of holy doctrine, the theologian, the interpreter and representative of Canon Law, than on his position as the celebrant of the Church ceremonies, sacraments, rites. He it is who understands how to deal with sacred objects, who alone is authorized to handle many of them and, at any rate as far as they come into the hands of the laity, is alone in a position to communicate to them the desired miraculous power. Holy water and rosary, benediction and invocation, amulet and scapular, crosses and pictures of the saints—however strange this "religion of things" may be to the Protestant, he must realize what an important part it plays in Catholicism. Where the service of God consists in a devout mind and a faithful fulfilment of duty, all Christians are on an equality; but the more holy objects, holy observances there are, the more necessary, important and powerful do the priests become. The important position which the priesthood thus acquires can not be said to follow as logically necessary from the previously discussed fundamental characteristic of Catholicism; it would be possible for Communion, Canon Law, Authority to enjoy prominence in a religion and yet for it to restrict itself to spiritual services, to allow no gay ceremonial to creep in. No one will fail to recognize an affinity between the naïve-sensuous disposition, which seeks satisfaction in a showy form of service, and the dependent mental attitude which can find happiness in the community alone. On the other hand, that gay ceremonial, especially in the Catholicism of the South and in the

Orient, which plays such an important part, contributes considerably to the authority the priests enjoy.

IV

The point where the sources from which the priest derives his authority really meet is Confession. In Confession the Roman Catholic ecclesiastic is priest in a technical sense, he is administrant of a sacrament, and at the same time judge, representative of Canon Law, teacher, interpreter of the Church Moral code which forms part of a comprehensive doctrine of salvation and is bound up closely with other dogmas. If we regard Worship, Dogma, Ethics and Church Organization as the four factors of religious life, it would appear on consideration that in Protestantism the Catholic conception of two of these factors, of Worship and Church Organization, has undergone considerable modification and simplification. A satisfactory insight into the divergences of the two Confessions is not to be gained by a study of Dogma almost exclusively, without considering the differences on the ethical side. That these are closely connected with dogmatic-religious differences is here natural. We may, however, feel inclined to ask if we should not start with the ethical differences as the deepest, the primary ones. For sometimes for long periods it was scarcely noticed that Catholic Ethics differed from those of Protestants, but when once attention was turned to this point, as has lately been the case (see Nerrmann's *Römische und evangelische Sittlichkeit*, 3d Ed., 1903, *Faith and Morals*, 1904, and Mausbach's *Die catholische Moral*, 4th Ed., 1913), a reconciliation of the two was found to be most difficult. And yet it would be an exaggeration to say that in a statement of the relations of Catholicism to Protestantism we should start with the ethical side and not with the dogmatical. We have said enough to show that a mere intellectual-dogmatical statement in the form of

an enumeration of the various differences of doctrine as used to be customary is insufficient. The fundamental difference already mentioned, that in Catholicism the craving for Fellowship is predominant, does not belong to the dogmatical side, it lies much deeper. It is a common spiritual attitude which makes itself felt in Dogma as well as in Organization and in Canon Law. This need of Fellowship, in conjunction with obedience to the authority of the Communion affects the religious as well as the ethical side. Even though the longing for Fellowship in religion may appear to us as the primary one, authority then springing from it, yet on the ethical side the case may seem to be reversed, or at least here the desire for support from others, and the wish to be led may seem essentially the same. From this point onwards the Protestant will certainly be conscious of his antagonism for Catholicism, however much he may recognize that a close connection exists between obedience to authority on religious and on ethical ground. For we regard as moral action in its highest sense only such action as is prompted by best knowledge and conscience, that is, by our own best knowledge and by our own conscience; our ethics are autonomous. While entirely admitting that we are in all matters constantly dependent on the judgment of experts, and that countless numbers are morally immature and will always remain in need of guidance, yet in heteronomous ethics, with the resulting phenomena such as "*Probabilismus*", we can only see a lack of recognition of the nature of the moral. With such concise formulas as the following, our ethics are autonomous and determined by conviction (*autonome und Gesinnungsethik*), those of the Catholics heteronomous and determined by law (*heteronome und gesetzliche Ethik*)—the distinctions are not equivalent, the former concerning the author of the ethical verdict, the latter the purport of the moral obligation—the distinction which here exists has not been exhaustively

treated or even so described as to ensure it against misconstruction. But when we place this difference beside the religious one already spoken of—that of the idea of Faith—we see very clearly how widely Catholicism and Protestantism are separated. That Faith with Catholics is an obedient acceptance of Church doctrine, and that in matters of ethics the Catholic submits to the decision of his father-confessor, who in his turn is dependent on the judgment of other moralists, are two points which are closely connected. (Here, of course, we do not wish to deny that many earnest Catholics themselves make their own ethical decisions as conscientiously and independently as is possible, and are second to no Protestants in this respect, but the Church and its priests have not seldom claimed that believers should submit to their verdicts instead of following their own consciences.) On the other hand we must associate Faith, as it is understood by Protestants, with autonomous ethics determined by conviction. Kant is indeed Luther's complement, a Father of the Protestant Church. To accept doctrines because the Church requires it, though one really doubts them, and to suppress these doubts, is in a Catholic meritorious, is Faith. We Protestants can at the best regard such conduct as proceeding from thoughtlessness; in a person capable of and therefore bound to reflection, however, as a sin. And to Catholics Kant's Ethics must appear as Unbelief.

V

In conclusion a few remarks. Firstly, when in considering the religious differences between Catholicism and Protestantism the ethical difference came to light, many a reader may have asked himself if one can treat the ethical side of the question without mentioning the ascetic ideal of Catholicism. It is indeed a point of great moment, and the chief difference in ethics between

the two confessions was for a long time considered to lie in the Protestant attitude to this ideal, that while asceticism did not at once in every sense disappear, yet the organization for an ascetic life, monasteries, orders, etc., did disappear, and even the clergy were no longer bound to celibacy. More attention was paid to this than to the above-mentioned differences in the principles of ethics. Besides, we may also here notice that this ideal was already exerting or was beginning to exert a powerful influence in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean at the time when Christianity was spreading. This is of great historical importance. The value of this ideal cannot be logically traced from the characteristics of the nature of Catholicism as we have described them, but since it came into contact with Catholicism and was adopted by it, it has greatly furthered the power and increased the influence of the priesthood.

Secondly, ethical differences easily appear to be the most irreconcilable. One other sort of difference there is which seems equally hopeless, and that is in epistemology (*die erkenntnis-theoretischen*). That Luther first of all rejected the metaphysics of Scholasticism was quickly forgotten, and that not without his own participation. But in later times wider circles have become conscious of the fact that between Catholics and Protestants questions of epistemology (*erkenntnis-theoretische Fragen*) are sometimes contested. The Protestant certainly can not and will not bind himself to any one of the various epistemologies (*Erkenntnistheorien*). But modern Scholasticism fights against Kant's criticism, and the Vatican Decrees, intended for the protection of natural and rational theology which affirms a philosophic recognition of God, have been rigorously emphasized by Pius X against the Modernism of our day. On the other hand, a logical necessity for Catholicism to bind itself to such doctrines is not evident. As

the Church of Authority it lies more in its interest to emphasize the importance of revelation to the exclusion of all philosophical speculation on religious questions. If we here look for a connection, we should turn to psychological reaction; just because authority stands firm, the human mind which demands it is permitted to wander in the realms of philosophical theology, is allowed far-reaching liberty. Similarly we can understand how it is that in questions of ethics, side by side with the authoritative power of the Church and the miraculous influence of the Sacraments, the natural capacities of man for good are so relatively highly estimated. In the development of the Catholic Church Augustine was only able to subdue his opponent Pelagius so incompletely that Luther found it very difficult to deal with that system.

Lastly, all that has been said till now referred to Catholicism, little expressly to the Church of Rome, to Papacy. It seems evident that as soon as Church organization obtains the position which according to our showing it has in Catholicism, a tendency towards union under one leader, a move towards centralization and monarchy will make itself felt. But this assumption does not nearly come up to historical fact, the concrete significance of Roman Papacy. Besides historical reality, with its details, its manysidedness, its riches, does not admit of philosophical construction.

Our statement was less philosophical than psychological. The reader himself will without difficulty be able to make the historical additions necessary to render it forceful. One remark more is needful. If we reject the old scheme of controverted doctrinal points and with it all sorts of ecclesiastical-political aims which have been deduced from it or which were explained by it, and if we by this means seem to lessen the possibility of a reconciliation of the Churches or a mutual understanding between them, that is yet but one side of the

matter. By attempting to replace dogmatical by philosophical considerations, other results are produced.

Dogmatics, Systematics, Logic deal in negatives and affirmatives alone, know no compromise, are intolerant. Psychology is more tolerant; it shows tension, polarity, antinomies, but its aim is to throw light upon these relations, to produce healthy dynamics, harmony of force. As the psychology of religion has shown us with respect to individuals that different religious types and needs have their rights and their values side by side, so the psychology of the Churches shows us that, in spite of sharp differences of doctrine and strong contrasts in organization and worship, Catholicism and Protestantism can in many respects supplement and enrich each other. In the struggles of the times we may not always see this higher harmony. We can but divine it. Let us however never forget it.

The Call of the Church to the Nations

By Allan Menzies, D.D.,
Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland.

Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands (Heb. *all the earth*)
Serve the Lord with gladness:
Come before his presence with singing.
Know ye that the Lord he is God:
It is he that hath made us and we are his; (another reading is, *and not we ourselves*)
We are his people and the sheep of his pasture.
Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, (or, *a thank offering*)
And into his courts with praise:
Give thanks unto him and bless his name.
For the Lord is good; his mercy endureth forever;
And his faithfulness unto all generations.

This Psalm is sung at every missionary meeting. Those who use it in this way can not be expected to think much of the position of the original writer of it, or of the position of the people in whose name he spoke. It is a challenge, an invitation to all the lands. What did those who first sang it in the worship of the temple know about the lands? What did they know about the religion of the lands? Other questions also arise before us about this Psalm. On what ground did the Jewish community of the temple venture to ask the lands to sympathize with them in their religion and even to take part in its rites? And what response did the invitation meet with, at the time or later?

When the Psalm was written, the Jews must already have known a great deal about the nations surrounding

them and about their various religions. The precise date of the Psalm can not be fixed, but the thoughts it expresses show it to belong to a somewhat late period of Jewish history. It claims that Jehovah is the Maker of all men and that He means well by all men alike, that He is constantly doing them good, that He wishes them to recognize Him as the source of good and to take part in the worship which ascends to Him. These thoughts do not belong to an early period in the mental history of the Jews; there will be general agreement that they belong to an age after the great prophets, they are based upon the great argument of the prophets, that Jehovah is above all the Gods of the nations, nay, that He alone is God, and that He is the Creator of the ends of the earth and of all those that dwell in it. These great conclusions are all embodied in our Psalm, which sets them forth in popular rhythmical form, in solemn simplicity, for great acts of national worship. By the time when the Jews reached these conclusions they knew a great deal about the nations of the world and about the religions they carried on. They knew about the Babylonians and their star-worship, for they had dwelt in Babylonia: they knew about the Egyptians and their worship of animals, there was a Jewish temple high up the Nile; they knew about the Greeks and their gods made in the likeness of the human figure. All this they knew, and they had been led to the conclusion that their own religion was far better than any of these and was destined to prevail over them all. The believers in all those deities might therefore well be asked to recognize Jehovah as supreme over them all and to take their place by the side of His people, entering into His gates, standing in His courts. The Jews had risen to the conception of a world-wide religion and here they issue their bold invitation to all lands to come and take part in it.

The religion in which all the lands are summoned to take part is described, it is true, in the most favourable

light, its harsher aspects are not dwelt upon. If a Babylonian or a Greek attracted by the summons made enquiry as to the terms on which he could be received as a worshipper of Jehovah, he would find some conditions in his way which were calculated somewhat to repel him. He must become a Jew; in order to obtain the whole of the promised blessing he must identify himself in a distasteful observance with the small people in a corner of the world. He must submit to the yoke of the law. He must close his place of business every Saturday. He must restrict his diet to foods the law accounted clean, giving up pork and oysters and many another delicacy. He must go to Jerusalem on pilgrimage, and arrived there, must take part in the killing and offering of a sheep or other victim. He must subscribe regularly to the keeping up of the Temple service and priesthood.

Of all this the hundredth Psalm says not a word.[1] It overlooks all those material considerations and speaks only of God, how good He is, how generous, how entirely to be depended on; and of man, how entirely he is God's creature, how deeply he is in debt to God for everything, how natural it is therefore that he should recognize the debt he owes, by praising God and worshipping Him. With regard to God, all men are in the same position, Jew and Gentile are alike His creatures and dependent on Him for everything; and there rises before the eyes of the Psalmist, not only in the hundredth, but in many another Psalm, the noble vision of a worship in which the whole world will join, a universal religion which will be recognized and welcomed by all nations, in which men of every race will gladly flock together to take their part.

What answer did the great invitation meet with? To judge from the Gospels, the Jews themselves had by the time of Christ to a large degree gone back from it, and

[1] The marginal reading v. 4, is rejected by Bäthgen; as is the interpretation in this sense of the title.

had come to think more of their superiority to other nations and of the necessity of keeping apart from them, than of any great acts of worship in which Jew and Gentile alike could join. The Temple, which was to be a house of prayer for all nations, was so no longer. The court in which the Gentiles were to pray was used for other purposes. Jew would not eat with Gentile nor come into contact with him when it could be avoided; the Gentiles were sinners in his eyes, they were dogs; they were to have no part in the Kingdom to which he looked forward. The efforts the Jews made to bring the Gentiles into their religion were very half-hearted and very unsuccessful. This declension from the generous anticipations of the past, deplorable as it was, was very intelligible when we remember how the Jews and their religion had been treated in the interval,—the Syrian King Antiochus attempting by force to make the people abandon their religion and grossly insulting it, and the Romans, who deprived them of their political liberty, treading that religion under their feet on various occasions.

But in the Acts we find a different state of things. Wherever Paul goes in the Mediterranean lands, he finds a body of Gentiles attending the Jewish Synagogue, attached to the worship of God which was carried on there. It was the same in every land. Thoughtful Gentiles, many of them people of wealth and influence, had come to see that the Jewish religion offered them what their soul was seeking, a pure and noble faith in an unseen God who was righteous and merciful, a faith reaching far into the past and holding out rich promise for the future. In the Jewish religion duty was made plain, which to Greek philosophy was surrounded by manifold doubts and difficulties; the God who had given the Ten Commandments was undoubtedly a righteous and holy God, who cared both for individual men and for human society, and the long history throughout which He had in many a telling instance rewarded the righteous and punished

the evil-doer and been faithful to His ancient promises, encouraged the heart to trust Him and seek His favour. In the provinces the Jews were less averse to contact with their Gentile neighbours, than was the case in Palestine; and so it came about that in the Greek cities of the Empire there was a large response to the invitation made to the Gentiles in the hundredth Psalm and other Psalms, to join the worship of Israel. It was among these "God-fearers" and proselytes and honourable women that Christianity was most readily accepted and that the ideal of our Psalm, of a worship of God in which both Jew and Gentile should join, came to be realized.

That is an interesting piece of history, perhaps more than a piece of history only. Some dreams pass for a moment over the mind of a community and are then no more thought of; but there are dreams which refuse to be forgotten, they cling to men's minds. Out of the dream a hope is born which grows stronger and stronger till in the course of time it matures into a living reality. The dream, the hope, of the hundredth Psalm is of this better kind. Once expressed it could not be left behind; when circumstances favoured, it was found that the community of the Jews had attracted to itself great multitudes of Greeks and other foreigners and that the praise of God went up from every corner of the inhabited world, from men of every nation and tongue.

The dream may be dreamed again. We are living in an age very similar to that of the early Roman Empire; all the ends of the earth are drawn together not into the same political system, but into the same region of thought. Men of all religions are meeting; we are acquainted as never before with all the religions of the world and are enabled to observe their differences and similarities and affinities. To us, too, the dream may come of a period when the veils that separate the different religions from each other will be drawn aside and the invitation of the Psalm, summoning all nations to a common worship of

the great God whose creatures they all are, will be repeated and obeyed.

Of this we speak.

When we sing the hundredth Psalm in church or at a missionary meeting, perhaps we feel a slight sense of unreality in the words of it, especially if we know something of the religions outside our own. How can it be that Mohammedans and Buddhists, and the followers of Confucius, should assemble in one congregation and lift up their voice to God in common acts of praise? Are not the different religions of mankind forever separate from each other? Does not each belong to a separate nation of which it is the inner soul, are they not shut out from each other by walls which can not be passed? Did God intend, we may ask in all reverence, that all the peoples of the world should belong to the same religion? Did He not make men different from each other in colour and feature and also in disposition and capacity and in the history through which they pass? Can we expect that they will abandon their age-long religions and adopt ours?

Well, there is something in each of us, not only in the practical missionary and in the enthusiast for missions, that forbids us to surrender the ideal of an ultimate religious unity. We all feel that human nature is the same all the world over. There is no race, we know, that is destitute of religion, however humble the religion be and whatever strange features it may present. There is nothing absurd in the idea of a religion that has room for all men under its wings, that sympathizes with the aspirations of them all and is able to provide accommodation for them all. It may be possible that there is such a religion, or that it may in course of time be attained; it may be possible that the nations may accept it, each keeping up at the same time what its history and its national character forbid it to abandon. The history of religion in the past, gives abundant warrant to expect that a faith, proved to be superior to others and held by a

community which heartily believes it and strictly lives up to it, will prevail over its neighbours, entering into manifold combinations with them, accepting what is best in them and giving up what of its own system is evidently not fitted to continue. The Christian religion is itself the greatest example of a faith which while enriching itself on every side with contributions of thought and ritual and practice, and giving up much that at one time seemed essential to its life, has prolonged its career and kept steadily to the pursuit of its goal of world-wide dominion. There is no reason to be seen in the nature of things or in the history of religion, why a worship of God should not be acknowledged over the whole world as true, if it proved to be superior to all others and was put before the world in a reasonable way. No doubt we have to take long views when we contemplate such a thing and have to overlook many a difficulty which may be in the way and many a possibility of error on the part of the adherents of such a religion, which may possibly damage its prospects irreparably. Still the thing is not impossible in the long run; the countries and continents of the world are rapidly coming to a better understanding of each other (O, that this war were ended!) and it is not merely in material appliances which are rapidly adopted by one country from another, but in other respects as well, in methods of study, in systems of government, even in the conclusions of philosophy, even in the standards of taste, that the one-ness of the human mind is being found out by all. And why should this not be the case also in regard to religion? Those who believe heartily in their religion as one in which there is light and freedom and healing for all nations, may well repeat the challenge of our Psalm and call all nations to enter its gates, to tread its courts. They may well look forward to the time—even if embracing it afar off by faith—when all the world will come, as it is called, to be united in their holy mountain.

The hundredth Psalm is helpful to us not only in what it says but in what it does not say; and the Christian mission—for it is of this of course that we are speaking as Christianity is the only existing religion which conducts missions on a large scale—may well study the hymn that is used at its meetings. The Jewish call to the nations does not mention circumcision, nor sacrifice, nor the food-laws of the religion. It does not mention the Sabbath, nor in fact regard the religion at all as a system of law or of ritual. No obligation is spoken of but that to God; His authority only is appealed to, no human authority is spoken of. All that is asked is that the Gentiles should recognize the claim their Maker has upon them and acknowledge it by joining in the praise Israel lifts up to Him. The religion is presented to them in its most attractive aspect; only its central doctrine is put forward.

The Christian mission may well take note of this, whether in its dealings with the heathen abroad, or with the seeker for truth at home, or with that subtle heathenism which lurks in the breast of most of us. The lesson we are taught is that in seeking to propagate our religion we should strive to see it at its best, on its most attractive side, in the light in which it is most fitted to appeal to all. Another lesson is that we should see the men to whom we present it, at their best, that we should make their conversion easy to them by abstaining from any harsh demands, calling for no unnecessary sacrifices. The endeavour to see our religion at its best, is the care primarily of theologians. It rests with them to determine what the religion is in its essence and what features of it are unessential. They have to present it in such a form that the acceptance of it may reasonably be expected of free and self-respecting men of whatever land. The theologians must tell us how Christianity may be presented to the heathen that they may accept it without being humiliated in their own eyes, sacrificing their judgment, or placing themselves under an authority not entirely

reasonable. This is a work which has to be done at home, not only by theologians, as we said, but also by all who are interested in the religion and desire to have it such as they need, full of truth and of genuine feeling, pointing them upwards and inspiring them to good works and holy living. The whole Christian nation must help in this if its missions are to succeed, for it is not only the missionary who carries the religion to other peoples; it is the nation that does so by its whole conduct and bearing.

The nation which sets out to communicate its religion to other nations must be a growing nation with a religion which is also growing and calls for its own propagation. Its missionaries will have to decide what is essential and vital in the message they carry, and on what part of the religion less emphasis may be laid. A missionary who has faced this searching problem could tell us better than a Scottish professor can, about these sacrifices. There are parts of Christianity which can never be sacrificed. The British Missionary Society has long recognized the value of industrial pursuits in missions, the churches generally now send out a complete Christian village with artisans and craftsmen as well as teachers and medical men, to plant on heathen soil a living specimen of the Christian civilization. Truthfulness, purity, honesty, decency, respect to parents must be strenuously enforced, all the world in every faith recognizes that a good religion must produce these good works and that a teaching which does not produce them, stands condemned. But how much of Christian doctrine is to be offered? Not the whole Shorter Catechism, one would say, nor the whole of the Common Prayer; something much simpler and more obvious will serve, if the religion is to prove attractive to young minds and not to bewilder them. Doctrines which have been much doubted in the West, may be withheld, at least for a time, until a soil has been prepared—if it ever will be—for such speculations.

Original sin is such a doctrine, it is not fitted to encourage; the doctrine of the Trinity is not fitted for the immature, nor any high view of the Sacraments. We would judge also that the doctrine of the threefold ministry of the church and of the succession of the clergy, was fitted to confuse rather than to build up young converts and that auricular confession will not tend to foster spiritual vigour among them. But, on the other hand, what can inspire and invigorate so strongly and permanently as to confront the convert with the great God who is the Maker of the world and his Maker, and to tell him that religion is simply walking with God, trusting Him for all things in this world and the next, seeking to have His spirit and to do His will? Along with this doctrine there must be of course the practical training in religious duties; one does not have such a God without wishing to serve Him in every possible and appropriate way; one naturally desires to speak to Him in prayer, to frequent the place where His people meet to express gratitude and homage to Him, to show kindness to the poor among His people and to help to bring others to His feet. Once the impression has been formed of the great Being with whom life is to be led, it will not be hard to form these habits and to make them appear easy and delightful.

The missionary of today is in a far better position than the Psalmist to preach this doctrine and to train in these practices. He has the help and example of that being whose life was fuller of God than that of any other descendant of Adam, and who was filled by this religion, which had in him full sway, with a power and charm which will never fade. It was to this God that he prayed "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes". He never suffered any other power to come between him and the most High. He loved the world he lived in and understood it with rare

insight as the work of infinite goodness. He understood God's children and could sketch them with such skill that we can not doubt he loved them and sympathized with them. He spent his life in befriending them, especially the weak and helpless and children. With such a guide to true religion we find the way to it open and easy and can call all men with assured emphasis to enter the gates of it and tread its courts.

These things we have put under the image of the missionary and his converts, but they concern us all. We are all made by God, the sheep of His pasture, the flock of His hand. It is the duty of all of us to praise Him and to live to His glory. In this age of restless movement it is well to be reminded of this fundamental aspect of our position in the world; that we are not our own and did not come of ourselves but in obedience to a higher power. If once we come to believe this thoroughly, if people generally come to believe strongly in God as their Creator and in the claims this gives Him on His creatures, we should not perhaps be saved from all religious uncertainty, but our doubts would trouble us much less, we should feel that the important things were settled for us beyond the power of doubt to shake them.

No doubt it seems to us in this age as if everything about religion were uncertain. The moorings which bound us not very long ago so strictly to the old faith have for many of us altogether parted and we are left to find the way for ourselves among the manifold currents and the fitful breezes of thought. Many are sadly unsettled, many have forsaken the church, and seem to themselves to be in the position of having to choose a religion and not knowing very well how to set about it. The great freedom and unbounded tolerance the age enjoys are no doubt good; one hopes that they may lead to a faith more deeply founded and settled in reason. Meanwhile we are like Justin or Tatian who went from philosopher to philosopher and could not attach them-

selves to any. A view on this side appeals to us and a view on that side, and we try to add it to our system; we see good in Islam and also in Buddhism, and allow each in some degree to influence us; we incline now to a code of positive injunction, and again to the plan of trusting God and ourselves without a code. We see the merits of the worship of saints and those of mysticism and those of the doctrine of purgatory. We find science to provide a sufficient religion, or the cult of beauty. So the poor soul is tossed to and fro without any firm anchorage.

That no doubt is the experience of the age; the individual does not pass through it all and yet the individual has part in it in proportion to his information and his idiosyncrasy. The age is willing enough to follow the truth and to do what it prescribes; but it wants a principle strong enough to drive it forward sufficiently amid the bewildering multiplicity of views and tendencies that are operating on every side. But such a strong guiding view is perhaps not far off. Signs are to be seen on many sides of a great change that is coming in men's thought about religion; that the period of dispute and uncertainty is passing away and the period approaching in which the positive convictions will be reached for which the disputes of the last generation have prepared the way. The sciences have ceased to be negative to religion. Their task is accomplished of clearing away the errors that rested on their various fields and they are considering the positive results which are left and are coming to the conclusion that the spiritual interpretation of the universe, pointed to by the spiritual instincts of mankind, may be right. Philosophy is coming to the same conclusion. The Bible is now seen in a reasonable light and appears as the record of a long advance in the knowledge of God, which came to its highest point in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. The churches are imperatively called to preach a God whom science and philosophy as well as the Bible and our own natural perception of the grandeur

and beauty of the world alike declare to us. The sciences do not forbid them but call on them to declare Him. The time may be at hand when lovers of truth beholding, each in his own field of enquiry, the wisdom and the purpose of a great spiritual Being, will turn to Him with the acknowledgment that of Him and to Him and through Him are all things, to whom be glory forever.

So do we trust and hope. Happy those who will behold this great sunrise! When the tremendous conviction that God is their Maker and has a right to claim all things of them and that He and no other has appointed them their tasks in His great world; when this conviction comes back to their minds and fully possesses them, then all things will be made new to them and all the difficulties which now beset their religious life will appear to them as trifles by the side of this great guiding truth.

Uniformity: Federation: Unity

By the Bishop of Bloemfontein.

There seem to be three points of view from which the problem of Reunion may be approached; we are apt to combine, and sometimes, confuse them; but it is important to keep them distinct, if we want to get a clear conception of the goal we have in view.

(1) First comes Uniformity. This point of view overlooks the deeper problems and is mainly concerned with surface difficulties; it does not try to heal the malady of disunion, but tries to reduce the irritation which springs from it. These palliatives are very familiar in the Mission Field, where a prominent difficulty exists in the tendency of native Christians to pass lightly from one denomination to another, and to select a resting-place in that body where the terms of communion are easiest and the demands least onerous. Why not meet this difficulty, and the friction which it causes, by agreeing on an uniform code of discipline, which all denominations shall accept? Another difficulty consists in the constant migrations of natives from one district to another, which often means from the sphere of influence of one denomination to that of another. Why not meet this by agreeing on the use of the same hymns, the same form of Mission Service, even the same catechism of elementary Christian truths, in the various denominations? Then the native Christian will feel at home wherever his wanderings may take him.

And, further, when uniformity in such matters has been reached, may we not be able to meet a third, and more formidable difficulty, the difficulty of the overlapping of denominations in one and the same locality? When

native Christians have become accustomed to uniformities of discipline and worship, may it not be possible to remove the scandal presented by half a dozen rival organizations competing with each other in a single native village or location?

Surely it should be possible, on the ground of such uniformities as have been established, to effect a distribution by which each of these localities should be assigned to a single religious body.

Such, we may take it, is the prospectus and the appeal for Reunion in the shape of Uniformity. The difficulties which it attempts to remove are obvious and pressing; but its methods of dealing with them are crude and superficial; it can indeed only plead its cause at all by resolutely avoiding any allusion to vital principles. If *e.g.* the apportionment of localities suggested above is to be carried out, it must proceed from some deeper ground of identity than the use of the same hymn-book or a common rejection of polygamy. The vital principles which underlie reunion will come into view presently, but I think it is pretty obvious that uniformity in externals is not the key to the problem. Is it even desirable in itself? On the contrary, elasticity, diversity, variety in such matters are actually necessary to meet the different degrees of education and civilization existing in different centres. If an underlying vital unity exists as a bond of union, such variety can be readily conceded; but where the sole such bond is external uniformity, there is no higher court where an appeal for variety can be entertained; and in such cases a code of uniformity will strangle progress without promoting unity.

Even within the limits of a single communion, such as the English Church, uniformity in externals can easily be pushed too far and become a positive impediment to cohesion and organic unity. Much more will it fail as a bond of union between separate communions divided by deep-lying and vital differences.

(2) Such, then, is the nature, and such the defects of the policy of Uniformity. It aims at relieving friction without removing the cause; it is external and superficial in operation; whilst the only ideal it can logically aim at, namely, a sameness of ceremony and ritual, is unintelligent and false. The conviction that this is so, impels the advocates of Reunion to take a further step in advance, and we are presented with the policy and ideal of Federation. With regard to Federation the following are points to be noted:

(1) Federation implies that each communion retains its own ecclesiastical entity unaltered; its creed, its organization, its fundamental principles remain as they were; but on the other hand all will be represented on a Central Council, which will be executive as well as advisory and consultative, and which will aim at drawing up rules and framing a constitution within which the federating bodies will henceforth carry on their work.

(2) The basis of such a Federation will be democratic; each communion will have an equal say in the drawing up of the constitution, and will be therefore morally bound to obey its rules and regulations.

(3) Now such a scheme obviously implies that the *differences*, that is, the points which separate the federating members, are non-essential and comparatively unimportant. The English Church, for instance, will have full liberty to retain its episcopal organization; but from the point of view of the Central Council episcopacy will be simply an amiable eccentricity, to be politely recognized and tactfully ignored when the real work of the Federation is being done.

(4) Again, waiving such unimportant differences, the Federation will lay down certain fundamental principles which must be accepted by all federating bodies: such as, agreement on certain truths which it regards as essen-

tial, and the equality, one with another, of all the federating bodies.

(5) Besides stating these fundamental principles, the Council will endeavour to give formal and quasi-legislative effect to some of the ideals of Uniformity, such as common discipline, common forms of worship and instruction, etc.; it will aim at the apportionment, by formal act, of separate spheres to separate denominations; and, as a natural outcome of the principle of equality, it will encourage the inter-change of pulpits and inter-communion amongst the members of federating bodies.

Such seems to be a fair account of the ideals and methods of Federation as a means of effecting the Reunion of Christendom; though it is only right to add that Federation is often presented to us not as a final achievement of Reunion, but rather as an important and necessary step towards that goal.

Now, whatever we may think of Federation either as an end or as a means, we must congratulate its advocates unreservedly on the zeal and earnestness with which they hope to use it as a remedy for the manifold and glaring evils of a divided Christendom. And, certainly, Federation goes beyond Uniformity in a very important respect: instead of making suggestions which individual missionaries (or other clergy) may or may not accept, it appeals to the denominations in their corporate capacity; the tentative suggestions of the earlier stage are to become "laws" passed by a Central Council at which each denomination has its seat. But the important questions to be asked are two: (1) Are the aims and methods of such a Federation as we have outlined good in themselves? and (2), if defective in themselves, are they likely to lead on to a better form of Reunion?

In the first place, then, it seems that Federation either goes too far or not far enough. If we are to turn informal

suggestions into rules, and let "comity" harden into law, this can only be done on the basis of a deeper unity than Federation can secure. Federation is an attempt to unite religious bodies which, *ex hypothesi*, will remain divided in their deepest and most vital principles; and an union of that sort is not strong enough to be a basis of legislation. Such a constitution is fatally artificial, an opportunist *pis aller*, a patchy compromise, in no sense a statesmanlike solution of the problem.

A single and crucial case will indicate this: Let us suppose that, by act of Council, we map out a country into a system of squares, like those of a chess-board, and recognize one square as exclusively Anglican, the next as exclusively Baptist, and so forth. And let us suppose that an Anglican moves, like a pawn, into a Baptist square. Then one of two things must happen: either he will communicate at a Baptist service, or he will not communicate at all; and we are not in a position to accept either alternative. In other words, a vital dividing principle comes into view, and the Federal Constitution is powerless to deal with it. This crux of inter-communion shows that comity must not congeal into law until there is a deeper underlying unity of life. Let there be as much courtesy as possible between denominations; let there be a general desire to avoid friction and competition and overlapping (and a great deal more might be done in these matters than is done today), but under existing circumstances such courtesy must not express itself as law. This does not mean that we are to remain for ever in the sphere of informal suggestions in the direction of courtesy and comity, as though these were the utmost that can be done in the way of Reunion; but it does mean that we can not go beyond such suggestions, such purely moral counsels of perfection, until we have a securer basis to build on than Federation can provide.

Can it, then, be argued that Federation is good as a step towards the full achievement of Reunion? It seems

extremely doubtful whether this is so. The Federal form of Government is a distinct type, not a phase passed through on a journey to something else. Where a number of states or colonies wish to come together, Federation and Union lie before them as two distinct alternatives, between which they have to make their choice. Recently Australia chose Federation and South Africa chose Union. The whole meaning of Federation is that each of the federating communities retains its own distinct life and individuality and a large measure of its independence; only in certain specified departments does it accept the authority of the Federal Government. It continues to cherish its old ideals, its own traditions, its own vital principles, and in all such matters is apt to be very jealous of any interference from above; the Federal Government must not go beyond its proper sphere, which is mainly on the external and material plane; it may rightly act as a curb on the separatist tendencies of the component factors, but must leave free scope for the development of their separate interests. A change, therefore, from Federation to Union would mean not so much evolution as revolution; it would involve the deliberate abandonment of a definite type of policy, and of the ideals and convictions which had led to its selection. And, ecclesiastically, one of the most serious objections to a scheme of Federal Churches is that it stands in the way of Union; that it presents us with an external and artificial association of differing systems, and thereby holds us back from arriving at vital unity.

(3) Unity, then, is left as the right goal to have in view, the only right method of dealing with our divisions. Federation would only perpetuate and stereotype them. And the moral of our last section is that, if we want Unity or Union at all, we must aim at it from the beginning; we must not hope to "muddle through" somehow to Union by starting with what is really an alternative and a rival system. By Union, then, I mean the fusion of different elements into a single whole. Union is founded on *unity*

of life, which pervades all the component elements, giving them strength and vigour, and enabling them to engage in actions of the greatest surface-variety without inconsistency or strife. And this unity of life is the unity of the life of Christ. The unity of the life of the Church must be the unity of the life of Christ; the Church is the body, of which Christ is the indwelling life. Where this unity of life exists, it is compatible with a large measure of diversity; the different members will have different functions to perform. The character of the services, the degree of local government exercised in various centres, the comparative importance attached to ceremonial, to preaching, to class-instruction, to lay-agencies,—all these matters and many others will vary according to the variation of environment; but since all are the expression and output of one inspiring and indwelling life, there will be no room for friction and hostility. If such defects do arise, it will be due to the fact that membership in the Church's body involves a conscious and voluntary action on the part of the members, who are thus able to rebel against that unifying life from which their own vigour is all the time derived. Let us take a single example: History tells us that the Methodists, whilst conducting their own class-meetings and mission services, used at first to make their communions at the altar of their parish Church. At that time the vital unity of the Church remained unbroken, and the Bishops should have laboured to retain such a relationship, which had in it the seeds of a beneficent revival. But when the Methodist Connection severed itself and established independent organs of sacramental life, the unity was shattered.

It may be argued in reply, that belief in Christ and zeal in His service are a real uniting bond between different religious bodies; and, further, that all baptized Christians do *ipso facto* share in that unity of sacramental life of which I have been speaking. And it is undoubtedly true, first, that belief and zeal may lead people to co-operate

in much good Christian work; but *co-operation in work* is not the same as *unity of life;* spiritual[1] life issues indeed in work, but comprises much besides, such as humility, meditation, joyfulness, peace, and love; and what we want is such an Union as shall bring all Christians to share in this fulness of the life of Christ communicated to us. Secondly, it is true that all baptized people share in the one life of Christ; this fact is indeed one of the most hopeful features in the case, one of the greatest encouragements towards Reunion. But the unity of Christ's life demands the union of all the members in an ordered whole. The diversity is to be a diversity of functions within the body, not an independence of one member from another. Because Christ is the only one indwelling life of Christians, therefore Christians are to form an organized body, in which there will be no schisms or divisions. So, the very fact of baptismal unity demands an unity of organization in which it shall be expressed and verified. Otherwise we are left with a heap of *disjecta membra,* which belong indeed to a single body, but have not come together in the unity of that body.

Moreover, Baptism leads on to the Eucharist; this divine life implanted in the one sacrament requires to be fed by the other. And the more keenly we feel the sovereign importance of our reception of Christ's life, in its bearing on Reunion, the more ready shall we be to recognize and approve of certain safeguards and guarantees for the due and orderly conveyance of that life. We Anglo-Catholics believe that in the priesthood and the episcopate we possess such safeguards. We do not deny the reality of grace given through institutional channels in non-episcopal bodies,—God forbid that we should do so—but, whilst God is free and unfettered in the bestowal

[1] See the admirable paper "Unity or Union: Which?" by the Bishop of Pennsylvania, issued in connection with the World Conference on Faith and Order. (Sec., Mr. R. H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, U. S. A.) The Bishop's "Union" is very much my "Federation."

of His unspeakable gifts, we are bound by our very sense of their greatness to use every precaution and provide every security for their reverent and right reception. We believe that our Orders give this security, that they stand for the organized unity of the body, within which alone can we expect the effective presence of Christ's life; that our priests are therefore in a peculiar sense representatives of the one body, authorized stewards of God's grace and accredited ambassadors of His love.

Unity of life, then, would seem to be the only satisfactory form for the Reunion of Christendom,—an unity of life in Christians which is the one life of Christ communicated to them, as one body, through channels which He has Himself appointed. We can not be content with an irrational Uniformity in externals, which does not involve any corporate *rapprochement* of denominations at all; nor can we accept a Federation of religious bodies which remain divided in their deepest and most vital principles.

"Unity of Life"—that is the one solution of the problem; if we have that we have everything. We shall do well, I believe, to make this unity of life the one central object of our attention. The conditions under which Reunion is possible are the conditions under which Unity of life can be secured and guaranteed. If we put forward the priesthood and episcopacy as a condition of Reunion, we do so just because we hold it to be a "guarantee" and security of that Sacramental life which is the only ultimate basis of Reunion. We do not want to thrust it arrogantly upon others; we offer it humbly to them as a possession which we value and which we want to share with them. We want to make it a contribution from our side, alongside of precious contributions to be made by them, to that Church of United Christendom which we all long to see.

Intercommunion

[The two articles which follow grew out of an article submitted by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, of the Church of England, in which he quoted a conversation with the Rev. D. Macfadyen, of the Congregationalist Church, on the subject of Intercommunion. The editor suggested that Mr. Macfadyen and Mr. Lacey should make their statements over their own signatures. As a result, Mr. Lacey forwarded the two statements with these words: "Mr. Macfadyen has closed with your suggestion, stating his case and defending his position. I have followed this up with a criticism which I have submitted to him and which he finds entirely inoffensive."

THE EDITOR.]

I

BY D. MACFADYEN, M.A.,

Minister, South Grove Congregational Church, Highgate, London.

The writer has been asked to re-state in writing the substance of a conversation which took place some years ago on the subject of Intercommunion. The occasion of the conversation was the writer's practice as a member of the Congregational Church, in communicating wherever he happened to be residing. The discussion turned on two points, the practice of claiming the privilege of communion in Anglican and Roman churches in places where these are the only or the most convenient representatives of the Christian Church: and the principles on which such intercommunion might be defended.

There are places in France, Italy, Switzerland and Southern Germany where the Church of Christ is represented only by a community observing the Roman rite and where the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper[1] is admin-

[1] The word "Mass" is a battle-cry and it is better in discussions such as this to avoid battle-cries: the name—derived from "*missa est*" is one of the accidents of history.

istered by a priest of the Roman Church. Similarly there are many villages in England where there is either no Free Church service—or no service at which the Sacrament is regularly and conveniently administered. When the writer has found himself in such a place he has presented himself for communion with other communicants, and has never found any question asked or objection raised by the officiating priest.

The principle on which this practice rests may be briefly stated thus:—The sacrament is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Lord's table is His own. It is of His appointing, not man's. Christ is the giver of the Feast, not the priest. The priest is the minister or servant of the Church. It is the sacrament of Christian unity in which all Christians are invited to testify that they are members of one body (I Cor. 9). As a Christian I claim the privilege of renewing my direct relationship to my Lord in obedience to His command, and in so doing realize afresh my membership in the mystical body of the Lord. When that privilege is offered to me no act of my will should refuse it. Every Church has a right to exclude unfaithful or unsuitable members, and if any officiating priest were to refuse to admit me to communion I should accept his decision as the decision of the constituted authority in that Communion: but I do not assume that I am excommunicated until told so in some regular form. I have never voluntarily severed myself from any body of Christ's people. The privilege and obligation of fellowship are too great to be voluntarily surrendered. The responsibility for such exclusion must be thrown on the persons who perform exclusion—and they must be asked to show adequate cause for their action. So far as I am aware I am not a heretic. I hold the Christian faith in its fulness and include in my thoughts of my fellow members all who hold the faith in unity of spirit and bond of peace.

Behind this position lies another on which it rests.

The practice of intercommunion as here described is not an individual idiosyncrasy. It rests upon a view of Congregational history and faith which although not universal is capable of adequate defense. I regard my action as normal and representative. English Congregationalists have the privileges as well as the disadvantages of not being a denomination. They have never accepted any of the definitions or personal loyalties which made a denomination. They are simply the English Christians who have stood aside when other people have formed denominations on what they regard as uncatholic grounds. All their objections to denomination-forming-definitions have been on the ground that the Catholicity of the Christian Church was being limited in some unjustifiable way by the insertion of uncatholic terms of communion. They severed themselves from Roman Catholics as Romans not as Catholics, because they found in Romanism a corruption of primitive Christian faith and practice. At the period which we freely miscall the "reformation in England" they protested against the definition of the Church by its relation to the State. They could not recognize in a geographical parish the natural limits of a community really defined by its faith, nor in a law court the final authority in a spiritual church. In the discussions which extended from the Westminster Assembly to the Savoy Conference they differed from the dominant Presbyterians because they were unwilling to see the Church of Christ limited by creedal definition. Though they sympathized with Whitfield's Calvinism rather than Wesley's Arminianism they were equally opposed to both when it was proposed to make the personal faith of any individual a new standard of the Christian faith. Many Congregationalists are in practice and theory Baptists, but they are not included in the Baptist Church because they do not regard any ritual act as constituting membership in a Christian communion. There is no negative in the Congregational affirmation as

to the nature of the Church. Congregationalism is merely a convenient method of organizing for worship and service those who profess and call themselves Christians. An imperfect analogy is presented by the Old Catholics in Germany who stood out against the new definition of the Church involved in the adoption of the dogma of papal infallibility. Congregationalists have always been found objecting to new definitions which limit the inclusiveness of the faith once committed to the saints.

I am aware that other views of Congregationalism have been advanced which borrow from the language of the moment some other method of defence. The cheapest and most unsatisfactory is that Congregationalism is democracy in religion. This is pure politics and stands on a par with the apologia for Anglicanism as representing monarchy in the church (No bishop no king). So far as Congregationalism is merely democracy in the church it has the faults of democracy without the virtues or prerogatives of a church. It is fickle—unstable—emotional, irreverent, and incapable of pursuing consistent ends for any length of time. But this is a travesty of the Congregational position which has received little or no support from our great leaders or interpreters. Our weighty men have recognized that we can only bear our true witness, and do our best work for the whole Church of Christ, when we make it clear that we are first members of the Body of Christ and only afterwards members of the political society, however constituted, in which the Church happens to live.

To those who believe in the mystical Body of Christ intercommunion is more than a privilege. It is a duty. It is a tacit recognition that the crown of all religion is the soul's relation to Christ and Christ's relation to the soul. In the perfection of that relationship all the meaning of religion is consummated, and all churches find the ultimate rationale of their existence. It is of first importance not to allow the claim of any one ecclesiastical

organization to exploit that relationship as its own property. To experience this relation is the common privilege of all who are identified by faith with Christ, and have accepted Him as the Perfect Mediator between God and Man. Unless that relationship exists, Christian churches are belated historical societies, studying the manners and customs of ancient times, and the sayings and doings of a particular historical personage who moved in realms of thought and amidst institutions which have long ceased to be. What makes the Church a living institution is a Christ who is the same yesterday, today and forever, and the possibility of establishing a personal relationship with Him which shall be in its own order as central for modern life as His own personality was for the day in which he lived. The fashion of the moment calls this relationship mystical, but it is only mystical in the same sense that English civilization is mystical as compared with German—and ethics mystical as compared with science. It is as real as love and as practical as faith. It is a testimony to the unity of the universe and the solidarity of humanity. It is bread of life in every sense but the material, and wine of life in every sense in which the word can be used except the wine merchant's.

If man has any claim to be a moral and spiritual being at all, what he lives by is expressed in Christ, and in Him he rises into the only ascendency over time and things material which is open to humanity. The communion of the Lord's Supper is for man everywhere the ever open gate into the Eternal. In the bread broken and the life poured out, the Eternal Divine life pours into time at a specific and definite point through opened hearts and awakened souls. This is the life-blood of the Church, and makes it the living past in the present, the inheritor of all the ages, the divine in the human, the Eternal in time, the one really alive community in all the generations of half-alive and half-moribund humanity. Whatever raises moral life gives it more meaning. Whatever inter-

prets spiritual life makes it more real. Whatever stirs the intellectual life helps to interpret it. At this point the greatest of the sons of men can lose themselves in an *O altitudo!* and the humblest can feed themselves on their royal birthright as children of the Highest. Every community of disciples is a church where this experience is opened to men; and all churches may be used as helps to those who seek it. The vitality of the experience enlivens the most mechanical and glorifies the baldest of rituals. *Ubi Christus ibi Ecclesia.*

II

By T. A. Lacey, M.A.,
Member of the Council of the English Church Union.

A criticism of Mr. Macfadyen's position is demanded. I can offer this with the greater freedom because with no little sympathy. Being critical, my examination must proceed on rather dry and technical lines, but I shall have something to say also on the spirit in which he approaches an important question of practice. I must in the first place however declare my conviction of Mr. Macfadyen's good faith. There seems to be no element of false pretence in his conduct; he does not pretend to be other than he is; he does not approach our altars as a member of our particular Church. He claims Christian Communion simply as a Christian, Catholic Communion simply as the Catholic Christian which he honestly believes himself to be. He does not apparently describe his particular position before making the claim, he does not approach the officiating priest with the statement that he is a Congregationalist desiring Communion, nor do I think that he is in any way bound to do so. He presents himself publicly among the faithful as the faithful Christian which without any doubt or hesitation he believes himself to be. There is truth and force in his

remark that it is the table of his own Lord to which he comes, and that he comes on the invitation of that same Lord, who alone is the Giver of the Feast. He makes his claim moreover with one important reservation which seems to me right and just. He acknowledges the right of the Church, as dispenser and guardian of the Sacrament to exclude from communion those who are counted unfaithful or otherwise unfit; if he is refused communion by authority of the Church he will submit, but he will not behave as one excommunicate unless he is excommunicated in regular form. This attitude, adopted in good faith, seems to me unimpeachably correct.

I am asked however to state the response which a priest of the English Church must make in face of this claim. There are two things to be considered, theory and practice. The claim has to be weighed in theological scales; it is necessary also to ask how a priest, bound by canonical obligations, should act when the claim is practically pressed home. I will try to keep these two things distinct.

In the first place, the claim must be rejected as theologically unsound. To avoid unpleasantness I will here drop all personal reference to Mr. Macfadyen. I treat his own good faith as beyond question, and for the purpose of the present discussion he becomes a type. He is professedly a Congregationalist, a member and a minister of an association which we can not but regard as schismatic. The question of heresy need not be raised; for the purpose of the present discussion a heretic and a schismatic are on exactly the same footing. To speak quite strictly, heresy and schism are personal faults of individual Christians; a member of a schismatical association may individually be free from either fault, his external position being due to circumstances beyond his control; his schism may be, in theological language, merely material, and not formal; no imputation of sin will then rest upon him, and his case will require particular consideration. But in

ordinary circumstances a member of a schismatical association must be regarded as presumably schismatic; he is involved in the sin of schism. The sin of schism, unpurged and unabsolved, is universally taken to be a bar to Catholic Communion. If any one ask me whether a Congregationalist can be admitted to Communion, I am bound to answer at large that he can not be admitted.

The answer on the practical side will be less simple. Mr. Macfadyen takes into account the possibility of his being refused communion. "If any officiating priest", he says, "were to refuse to admit me to communion I should accept his decision as the decision of the constituted authority in that Communion." One would expect no less of him; to make a disturbance at such a time, or even a loud protest, would be unseemly. But from the priest's own point of view there is more to be said. Congregationalist practice may perhaps lead Mr. Macfadyen to exaggerate the authority of the officiating priest. A Congregationalist pastor, if I am not mistaken, is the supreme authority in his own Communion, and his decision may very well be final. But a priest of the Catholic Church is a man under authority, having himself only a limited pastorate of souls. Here it may be well, for the sake of clearness, to fall back upon technical terms. A priest, even a parish priest with cure of souls, has no ordinary jurisdiction *in foro externo*. He may have jurisdiction *in foro conscientiae*, which he exercises regularly in the tribunal of penitence, and in some sort he can bind or loose also in the way of advice or instruction privately given. He can thus grant or withhold absolution; he can warn an impenitent sinner not to approach the Lord's Table. In this sense he can repel from communion, as he is instructed to do in a rubric of the English Prayer Book, well known though little observed. But when he has done this he must report the case to the Bishop, in whom all further responsibility is vested. How far he may go in repelling is a difficult question. If, in spite of warning,

the person repelled presents himself openly at the altar, may the priest disregard the claim to communion thus publicly made and refuse him the Sacrament? No rule or practice of the Church with which I am acquainted seems to authorize this, except on rare occasions. The reason is clear. Openly to refuse communion is to impose a public penance, and such penance is subject to two limitations. In the first place public penance may not be imposed except for an offence equally public. In the second place the imposition of public penance is reserved to the Bishop or some person expressly appointed by him to that office. The former limitation is dictated by natural justice; the latter is a rule of ecclesiastical order.

Apply these principles to the case of a schismatic. One who is notoriously such may be openly refused communion. But what is notoriety? In the strictest interpretation it must be what is technically known as *notorietas iuris;* that is to say, the offender must have been publicly censured by a competent authority. In a word, he must be excommunicate. Mr. Macfadyen is quite right when he declines to assume that he is excommunicate until told so in regular form. Some confusion of thought is caused by the use of the phrase "excommunication *ipso facto*". This does not mean that certain offenders become excommunicate immediately on the commission of their offence; it means that when the fact is proved before a competent tribunal, the judge has no discretion but must proceed at once to sentence of excommunication. When schismatics are said in the sacred canons to be *ipso facto* excommunicate it is meant only that they are subject to excommunication on summary process. But there is yet more to be said. There are degrees of excommunication and different kinds of sentence. It is not only the major excommunication that serves for exclusion; the minor excommunication suffices, but this must be imposed with due publicity, and one requisite is that the

offender shall have been openly by name proclaimed excommunicate.

It follows that only on rare occasions will a priest be justified in withholding communion from one whom he knows to be a schismatic. Even the minor excommunication is a sentence rarely pronounced. It must not be supposed that any groups of persons, however publicly associated, are excommunicate in bulk. No such excommunication exists in the practice of the Church. Apparent exceptions are only decrees of *ipso facto* excommunication, or even less. A striking example may be found in the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, issued by Pius V against Elizabeth of England. It was a sweeping condemnation of the queen, of all who aided and abetted her, and of all who continued her policy; she herself was definitely excommunicated by name, so far as the authority of the Roman Church extended; but the rest who were condemned with her, though threatened with excommunication, were not even *ipso facto* excommunicate. The proof is found in the fact that Urban VIII, when urged to excommunicate her successor and the continuer of her policy, James I, refused to do so. Excommunication is a purely personal censure imposed upon an individual offender for his individual correction. Not every one who deserves excommunication is excommunicate; if it were so, perhaps communicants would be few. The fact that a man ought to be excommunicate is in itself no reason for refusing him communion.

On a strict interpretation of his duty then, a priest can withold communion only from one who is excommunicate in regular form. But this strictness is subject to two modifications, imposed by common sense and recognized in the practice of the Church. A priest may withhold communion from one who presents himself in a grossly irreverent or indecent manner. He may take the same course if he has reason to know that some of the faithful present would be offended by the admission of a notorious-

ly scandalous person to the Lord's Table. The same law of charity which forbids the public penalizing of a secret offender forbids with even greater reason the scandalizing of the faithful. In this case the notoriety required to justify exclusion is not *notorietas iuris* but *notorietas facti*, and the greatest caution is necessary in acting upon it. Here again, a rubric of the English Prayer Book is to the point. The curate is to warn any "open and notorious evil liver" not to come to the Lord's Table; nothing is said about the duty of the priest in case the person so warned should presume to come, but it seems to be a generally accepted practice openly to pass him by, and to report the case to the Bishop. It is obvious that by an "evil liver" is meant any one who for any cause may rightly be debarred from communion; in other words, one who is liable to excommunication. The phrase does not indicate only moral delinquency, but will cover all grave offences against ecclesiastical order. It follows that a schismatic may be so repelled, but only if his offence be known to some of those present, and as the rubric says, "the congregation be thereby offended".

The conclusion appears to be, that a Congregationalist presenting himself for Communion, can be openly repelled by the priest only in one of two cases; if he be formally excommunicate, or, if the faithful present would be scandalized by his admission.

So I answer the question before me, in theory, and in a more or less strict interpretation of the practice of the Church. But it deserves further consideration. What is the bearing of Mr. Macfadyen's practice on the wider issues of Christian unity and disunion? From this point of view it seems far more important than as regarded from any merely technical standpoint. Can Mr. Macfadyen, as a Congregationalist, claim communion at Catholic Altars? Certainly not; the claim would be grotesque. But that is not his claim. He does not present himself as a Congregationalist. He presents himself as a Chris-

tian, as the Catholic Christian which he believes himself to be. Here is an important factor in the situation. Mr. Macfadyen may be ordinarily involved in schismatic action, but in so presenting himself at the Altar he abates his schism. The essence of schism is a refusal of Catholic Communion, active or passive; I mean a rejection of Catholics from Communion, or a refusal to communicate with Catholics. To seek Catholic Communion is to abandon, if but for a moment the attitude of schism, and there is something of yet greater importance to be said. The sin of schism lies more in temperament than in overt acts. A willingness to seek Catholic Communion seems to show that the schismatical temper is tending to disappear, if it is not yet entirely absent. But if the temper of schism is weakening, and if the practice that we are discussing has the effect of reducing it yet further, there is in it an element of hopefulness which must not be overlooked. This must be our final consideration.

The worst kind of schism is that which is content to be schismatical. The worst effect of a prolonged schism is acquiescence in a state of things which reduces the Church of Christ to a group of disconnected sects. Exclusive Communion is the ritual mark of that state of things. There are barriers erected by sound ecclesiastical rule; the powers of the Keys, the right use of excommunication, must not fall into oblivion. There are other barriers erected by self-will, by prejudice, and by ignorance. To pass a legitimate barrier without authority is a grave matter; to break down the other barriers must be right. But even a trespass may be tolerated where it makes for good. It may help to abate acquiescence in disunion. Mr. Macfadyen's plea shows how it will work. In communicating at our altars he sees that he necessarily submits himself more or less to the control of our constituted authorities. That is an important step. So long as a Congregationalist or a Presbyterian is content to live as such, and demands nothing more, he may treat the au-

thority of a Bishop as of no account; but when he seeks Communion at the hand of a priest who is under episcopal authority, he abates something of that independence. The key which opens can also shut. To avoid prejudice let me think of my own case also. If I shut myself up in Anglican exclusiveness—I have not the least intention of doing so—I can treat the Church of Rome as of no more account than any other group of Christians, the Roman Pontiff as of no more importance than any other minister of the Gospel; but if I seek communion at an altar where the supreme authority of the Roman Church and the Roman Pontiff is actively recognized, I bring myself, at least for the time being, within the ambit of that authority. The great peril of Christendom at the present day is to settle down to sectarian exclusiveness. Barriers exist, and are not to be ignored in a spirit of foolish optimism, but they should not be treated as immutable. Every attempt, every desire, to pass them involves at once a theoretic recognition of Christian unity and a practical recognition of a Christian order which is more than sectarian. There is one step gained; the ultimate term of progress is recognition of an order, an authority, which shall be nothing less than Catholic. If this be the promised fruit of the practice which Mr. Macfadyen defends, it may well be tolerated. It can hardly be allowed, but toleration means something else. I have shown that it can hardly be prevented in the existing state of ecclesiastical discipline; it is therefore tolerated in fact. The toleration is not avowed. A public avowal of it might come perilously near to formal permission, and bring about a serious weakening of discipline; but continued toleration of the practice, with full knowledge of the fact, need not have any such dangerous consequence. The claim can not be allowed; but in view of its implications it might be unwise so to stiffen the course of ecclesiastical discipline as to make its prosecution impossible.

A Constructive Sketch of St. John the Divine

By The Most Reverend Evdokim,
Russian Archbishop of North America.

That they all may be one.

We behold John a youth, John an adult, John a white-haired centenarian. His penetrating gaze is always turned equally towards heaven, towards the world beyond the clouds and above the stars, where stands unshakable, the eternal throne of undying truth. The heavenly world is his own precious world, his constant familiar element. His fiery thought is always turned towards it and no earthly care ever penetrates his soul, dissipating his attention and drawing his eyes away from that world. For the sake of this world John without hesitation left once and for ever father, mother, home and occupation. There had been nothing in his life heretofore but constant longing for the heavenly world: every line of his writings is marked with the breath of the heavenly realm and the echoes of the life of the supreme world, not of the heavenly denizens alone but even of God Himself. His writing is as deep as the vast sea and as high as the high skies. This is why he reminds us of an eagle who soars high above the earth or of a dweller in heaven who has the supramundane mysteries within his reach far above any human being. And so St. Jerome says of him: As if wearing the wings of an eagle and rising to great altitudes, John discussed the word of God. Another holy father also says of our Apostle: Like an eagle, John preached the supreme, and keenly

observed the interior life of eternity. St. John Chrysostom writes that having terminated his speech on the previous night by contemplating the great eagle, the truly great eagle, exceeding in his spirit the heavens and the heavenly powers, and reaching up to the supreme beginning of all, John exceeded all creatures more than the most powerful among the eagles. He exceeded the sounds of the most powerful thunder, announcing the eternal heavenly wisdom of love alone. Saint Proclus wonders who raised St. John to such a great height, who gave such powerful wings to his mind, for by the strength of his faith, abandoning the earth, he passed through the air, penetrating the ether, and soaring through heavenly altitudes far above the earth, ascended higher than the heavens, passing by the archangels, reaching the seraphim, and standing before the cherubic throne of the Lord on the wings of his faith, thundered forth the ineffable birth, announced the ineffable Being, heralding God the Word which has no beginning. The same great Patriarch of Constantinople says that this evangelist raised himself above the seraphim, for they can not behold the supreme radiance without covering their faces, whereas he, by the grace of God, was enabled to speak of both the being and the birth of God the Word. And St. Basil the Great says that John, the Son of Thunder, preached the evangels with more articulate words than anyone, announcing that which can not be contained by every ear or understood by every mind. Although John the Evangelist began to write after the others, yet he was ever to lift his understanding or, more truly, was lifted by the power of the Spirit, above everything pertaining to the senses or time, stepping forward before the Most High; he reached the very beginning and leaving all the ideas of flesh and time below his theology, he announced mysteries more audibly than any preacher who preceded him; he said: The beginning is not from Mary, it is not from our time, for *in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

In these few words he concentrated the idea of the Eternal Being, of the passionless birth, of the oneness of all nature with the Father, and the greatness of life. St. Gregory Dialogos says that John raised himself above the other evangelists by the power of contemplation. He raised himself above himself even, not only was he above the other three, but even adding himself to them, he still was above the four. St. Augustine says that he thundered forth that which never was taught by any other evangelist.

This is why the holy fathers and the teachers of the Church compare John the Apostle to an eagle. This is why the eagle is his symbol *par excellence*. This is why this symbol is always ascribed to John in the present and will be ascribed to him in all future times. Indeed, the language of men holds no more faithful or accurate comparison to express the exalted character of this Apostle's doctrine.

Living chiefly the life of the spirit and soaring with their thought in the world of ideas and ideals, people such as he consider life in a peculiar way. In every phenomenon they look for the reflection of the world of ideals. In the life of men they seek the complete, not the partial, realization of the ideals which are their own familiar element. Possessed with the fiery longing to perceive what is good and true everywhere, ready to sacrifice for them everything that turns towards the life of man, often meeting with profound disappointments, people such as he know of no obstacles able to stop them on the chosen way. Neither poverty nor labour in excess of their strength, nor the general contempt, not even death itself, could stop them. All for all is their pass-word, and they know of no other attitude towards life.

John found in the Saviour the realization of all his hopes. For him Christ was the ideal, higher than which he could imagine nothing. The Apostle met no man who could at all compare with Him. He was an example of every perfection. That which the wise men of all antiquity

tried to understand, that which was impatiently looked for by kings and prophets, that which was foreseen by righteous men in moments of holy ecstasy,—all that was revealed in Jesus Christ. John beheld this visible image of the invisible God face to face. John found what never was found before throughout centuries in the life of nations. In the teaching of Christ John found the answer to questions for which he could never before find any solution. In His every word and act the Apostle beheld the manifestation of the primordial divine power and wisdom, the revelation of heaven itself towards which many a time he had turned his eager gaze in vain attempts to penetrate its mystery. Now when he turned his wistful eyes towards heaven he found no mysterious curtain which he sought in vain to pass. The very first time he saw Christ he decided once for all to give himself to Him altogether and unreservedly. John never lost this unconditional devotion and tender affection for Christ from the very first days of his calling to the last hours of his life. Since the moment when he asked the Saviour for the first time, Lord where dost thou dwell? until the time when, weakened by old age, he only could repeat, "Little children love one another", John never lost the feeling which filled his soul when he beheld the Saviour on the bank of the Jordan for the first time. His complete faith in the Saviour never wavered. He was never confused by the distrust of Christ on the part of the learned and the priests. In a fit of unholy anger the guides and leaders of the chosen people asked the Saviour "Is it not true that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" But even these insane words could not shake the trust of John. The contempt and hatred of the many never shook the faith of John and he never for a moment thought of leaving Him even after Christ had rebuked him for his and his brother's thoughtless action. His faith remained firm even under the scourge of His shameful death on the cross. Everywhere and always John remained with

Christ, and the same feelings inspired him even after the Ascension of the Lord until he was a white-haired centenarian.

It is this devotion which made John listen with such profound attention to the exalted and mysterious sayings and conversations of the Lord. Every word and every motion of the great Teacher was followed with profound attention by John. His mind, his heart and his will centralized in one point. John was all attention. His whole soul was in the contemplation of Jesus. John always was to be found the nearest to the Teacher, always sitting next to Him. Ofttimes the other disciples left the Saviour, be it even for a short while, but even then we see John still with Him.

In this persistent way John followed the Saviour more than one year; and owing to this constant, profound intense attention, nothing escaped the eyes of the disciple, not the smallest detail of the Teacher's life, not a word He ever spoke to anyone. Here is his own testimony concerning his own Epistle: That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have beheld and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life. . . .) (I John 1:1–2); or else: This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that his witness is true (St. John 21:24). Recalling everything that he ever heard from the Saviour, St. John is overpowered by the immense vastness of all that he saw and heard. He recorded a great many events in the life of the Saviour, many more than the other evangelists. Yet coming to the end of his gospel, John realized that only a very small part of the works of Jesus had been noted down by him. Here are the last words of his gospel: Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book (St. John

20:30). And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written (St. John 21:25). In this way we learn of the Apostle himself that he assimilated everything that was ever done by the Teacher, yet we would have had to draw the same conclusion even if John had never left to us this testimonial concerning himself. As a pure limpid sheet of water reflecting the moonlight with the clouds, the mountains, the great trees, and the smallest plants on the shore, the consciousness of John bore the imprint of everything with the exactness, clearness, and precision of a photographic camera. One has merely to glance through the Gospel of St. John to be profoundly convinced that he described the life and activity of the Saviour with the most striking minuteness and precision.

For instance, John never fails to mention the time at which this or that miracle took place, this or that saying was uttered. Here are examples: His disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house shall eat me up (2:17): When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this; and they believed the scripture, and the word Jesus had said (2:22): The same came unto him by night (3:2): And it was early (18:28): Now it was the Preparation of the passover: it was about the sixth hour (19:14): It was about the sixth hour (4:6): And it was night (13:30): it was about the tenth hour (1:39): On the morrow he was minded to go forth into Galilee (1:43): And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee (2:1): Now on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, while it was yet dark (20:1).

It is not necessary to mention the other numerous similar statements. The minuteness and precision with which John mentions the location in which the evangelical events were enacted is just as striking. Not only does he

mention various towns and villages of Palestine but even little hamlets which otherwise were quite unimportant; he quite obviously knew the distances from one site to another. The multitude which stood on the other side of the sea (6:22): howbeit there came boats from Tiberius nigh unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks (6:23): When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they behold Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the boat: and they were afraid (6:19): And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there (3:23): So he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph; and Jacob's well was there (4:5–6): and Jesus was walking in the temple, in Solomon's porch (10:23): Now there is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool, which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having five porches (5:2): Jesus . . . departed thence into the country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim; and there he tarried with the disciples (11:54).

John is perfectly familiar with the topography of the brook Kedron, of the Garden of Gethsemane, the court of the archpriest, the praetoria, Golgotha, the garden of Joseph of Arimathea with the cave in which Jesus was laid, and Bethany. Likewise John knows all the feasts of the Jews. He describes with many details and great exactitude the various solemnities and religious processions which took place in the Temple at Jerusalem on certain days and at certain hours. Sometimes he omits any description of them, but it is evident that in writing he always had them before his eyes. This is why we can fully grasp all that John tells us in any given case only if it is possible for us to reproduce all the circumstances of it. For instance, in a certain passage he refers to a certain solemn rite of the Feast of Tabernacles. Daily after the morning sacrifice in the Temple, huge crowds of people together with the priests on duty walked to the holy well

of Siloam. And while proceeding there they sang sacred psalms. Once there, the priest filled a golden vessel with water, and then turned back towards the Temple amid the joyful acclamations of the people, the sounds of trumpets and cymbals and sacred singing. When back in the Temple, the priests performed the rite of ablution on the sacrificial altar, the people singing in the meanwhile to the accompaniment of musical instruments the words of the Prophet Isaiah which referred to the Messiah. John was well aware when and what kind of sacrifices were offered in the Temple, what countries and what cities sent worshippers to Jerusalem on great occasions, what these worshippers did in Jerusalem, what feelings they experienced, and what rites they performed. John knew what was the spirit of the people, representing to the smallest detail the outlook of the Jews, their views of the Messiah as well as their attitude towards the heathen, the proselytes, the publicans and the Samaritans. He knew the customs of the people, the almost numberless casuistical scruples and prescriptions of the teachers and guides of the people. He knew who and when was the archpriest, or the procurator, and what was his attitude towards the Hebrews. John knew the organization of the Roman Army, its commanders and soldiers, distinctly discriminating between them and the Jewish officials. It would seem that there was no single feature in the life of the Jews, either private or social, that John has not mentioned. And whatever he mentioned, his words proved that he was familiar with Palestine and an eye-witness of all. The way he describes individuals, for instance, is so inimitably simple yet so natural and psychologically true. Here stands Nicodemus before our eyes, a Pharisee of great reputation. He seems to live before the eyes of the reader. And here, another person, the woman of Samaria; with what inimitable simplicity and how truthfully and correctly, John describes to us her mood. John drew equally well the characters of the many other

people who had anything to do with the Saviour: the palsied man, the woman who was brought by the Pharisees to be judged by the Saviour, the man who was blind from birth, Lazarus and his two sisters from Bethany, Pilate, the Roman procurator, Joseph of Arimathea, in secret the disciple of Christ, and Mary Magdalene. Every word of his breathes a most inimitable truthfulness, each line revealing the author completely. Reading all these descriptions, we can not but be entirely convinced that they could be written only by an eye-witness.

John's ardent love for his Friend and Master naturally made every word of the Saviour and every thought and feeling He expressed cut deeply into the pupil's soul; here his wonderful power of observation was of the greatest assistance to John. As St. Augustine says, he mysteriously poured into himself the grace of this divine Source, and in so doing he assimilated not through analysis, dialectic or syllogism, but through direct contemplation. And because of this all that was heard by John became his own property, blending organically with his early views. Gradually, year after year, he learned to understand the teaching of the Saviour with all the profundity of its theological and speculative contemplation and exalted mystical character. When so many murmured against the Saviour for His talks of the Bread of Life, when many of His disciples left Him, the Saviour asked the remaining ones: Do you also abandon me? He would not keep them by force or persuasion, for staying because of these reasons amounts to leaving him. Yet none of them would go. Speaking for all the others, Peter told Him why they could not leave Him. "Lord, he said, to whom could we go? Thou hast the words of life eternal." How profoundly John in particular was impressed by the exalted sayings of the Lord we can easily see from his writings. The style of John's writings alone reflected the peculiar build of his soul. One can not escape noticing a certain peculiarity of this apostle's writings. He writes in such a way that it

is difficult at times to distinguish where the Lord finishes, in the gospels, and where His speech is taken up by the evangelist or John the Baptist, or some other person. He is so penetrated with the very sacred spirit of his great Teacher's doctrine and assimilates it so profoundly that it would seem at times that we still heard Jesus Himself speaking when John already began to comment on it. His first Epistle is hardly distinguishable from his Gospel, being like it in spirit and in letter. Therefore there are some men of great learning who affirm that the same dialogues recorded in the Fourth Gospel do not belong to the Lord but have been invented by John himself.

But in describing the works and doctrine of the Saviour John seems to forget even his audience. All his unusually great attention, his observant eyes, are fixed on the heavenly features, his hearing is opened to the Master's holy sayings. Therefore like a true echo he transmits them without change for the most remote times and peoples. Through John the most authentic form of expression of Jesus Christ has been preserved to us with all the minute shades of thought and feeling, so that in the most intricate places they are left without change, and the understanding of the readers is helped by additional explanations and not by a change of the original words. And in this there is nothing to wonder at. Do we not find in the works of well-known authors expressions and ideas which strike us so much with their charm that we try to remember them literally, abstaining from changing anything in them for fear that the very thought might lose its elasticity, its freshness and its charm? Moreover, John had been the pupil of the Lord precisely at that period of his own life when authors acquire the characteristic peculiarities of their style of thought and their direction. Was it possible, then, for him to have remained uninfluenced by Him?

The simple solution of the problem of the exceptional relation between the Saviour and St. John lies in the pecu-

liar build of this disciple's soul. John was chosen by Him not only to be one of the Twelve chosen among a number of disciples, but even to be one of the four elect of the elect. He was a member of this holy and great apostolic union. Yet even among these elect his position was exceptional. He was the chosen one among the chosen. He alone is mentioned in the Gospels many times as "the disciple whom Jesus loved". The others also were beloved, but he better than all, as is stated in one of St. John Chrysostom's homilies. St. Peter stood out as the defender of Christ. St. John was His intimate friend. Apocryphal writings also state this, and St. Gregory of Nyssa says that of all women one was chosen to be the Mother of Christ, and among all the disciples one was chosen to be His friend. No other apostle could see so profoundly into the Master's soul, none understood Him so well, as St. John. He was the only one capable of penetrating the hidden motions of the soul of Him Who was God and Man. There was a certain inner spiritual kinship between the Master and the disciple. That which was the eternal natural element of the One was also natural to the other; the regions, on which always dwelt the gaze of the One, the other also tried constantly to reach. The sublime and mysterious words spoken by the Saviour in farewell so entranced the favorite disciple that he forgot everything in the world. As if not satisfied even with this nearness to the Master, in the holy, solemn moments when all the other apostles were in anguish and fear, when even the chief of them was frightened, John, as if in gladness, leaned close to Jesus, even pressing his head against the Master's breast, wishing to become one with the Master in these moments. St. Augustine and St. Gregory of Nyssa say that, resting his head against the Saviour's bosom, John mysteriously absorbed the grace of this divine Source and that his lips drank divinity from the Master's breast. Therefore, St. Augustine calls him "the word of God itself". And, indeed, the farewell discourse of the Lord, divine, supreme

and touching, because He put His heart into it, filled with love of His disciples and of all the human race, left the most strikingly living mark on the memory and the heart of the beloved disciple. Of all the evangelists, he alone transmits it to us with minute details. Long decades could not blunt in him the memory of it. In the twilight of his great age he tells about it as vividly as if it took place the day before. This is why St. John is always called the confidant of Christ.

Whilst our Lord was on earth, John was inseparable from Him. And when the most sublime moments in the life of the Heavenly Teacher came, the heart of the beloved disciple seems to have become still more ardent with devotion to Him. After the Last Supper John never leaves his Master for a single moment. He eagerly listens to His every word, he attentively watches His every gesture, and takes note of everything that takes place among his brother apostles, even in thought. Here we see him with the Master in the Garden of Gethsemane; when the guards surrounding the Saviour frightened the other apostles away, John and Peter still stayed with Him. In spite of danger they followed when the soldiers led their Master to the High Priests Caiaphas and Annas. John had the courage even to enter their court with the soldiers who kept guard over the Prisoner. John's love for the Saviour was stronger than the fear of death. Here the beloved disciple stayed the many long hours of this night of shame and anguish. Morning came, yet still he would not leave the Saviour. No event of the last moments in the earthly life of the Saviour escaped his observant eyes. He saw Peter, who had so recently asserted that he would remain faithful were even all the others to leave Him, deny any connection with Christ. John witnessed the trial of Christ by Annas, Caiaphas and Pilate. He remembered every detail of the long trial, all the questions of the judges and the Saviour's answers; John also noted Pilate's attempts to defend Jesus. He saw the soldiers making a

crown of thorns and placing it on Christ's brow; he saw Him being clad in the purple robe and smitten on the face, and heard the soldiers say: Hail, King of the Jews. He saw Jesus stand side by side with the robber Barabbas, in a robe stained with His blood, and heard the significant word of Pilate, *Ecce Homo*. In vain did Pilate try to soften the hearts of the mob by the sight of the terrible suffering of the Great Prisoner: their hearts were too hardened and too full of anger. The shouting grew only louder: Crucify him, crucify him! In vain Pilate offered to free the Prisoner at the Passover, conforming to the good custom of antiquity: they preferred to free the robber. In vain Pilate reminded them of their wish to have a king of their own, saying: Behold your King! They cried again and again: Away with him, crucify him! They hurled threats at Pilate until he let them have their own way. Christ was led away to Golgotha and crucified.

St. John's fervent devotion to Christ brought him also to Golgotha. The scourge and crucifixion failed to confuse John. He remained on Golgotha even after almost all had gone, when his beloved Master had only a few moments more to suffer. He Who had been crucified cast a look at those who still stood there, and saw His beloved disciple, confidant and friend, and at his side His own Mother. Love was so abundant in Jesus that even on the threshold of death on the cross His heart was still open to His friend. He raised His voice to entrust into the care of John that which, as man, He still held dearest on earth. He said to the disciple whom He loved: Behold thy mother!

John's devotion gave him the strength to stay by the cross when even the nearest followers of Christ had left it. He heard the Saviour say: It is finished. He saw Him droop His head. John still stood there when the soldiers broke the legs of the two robbers to hasten their death; he heard the soldiers talking among themselves, hesitating to do the same with the Great Sufferer, one of them at

last piercing His side with a spear, blood and water coming forth. At this, John remembered the ancient prophecy that "a bone of him shall not be broken", and that "they shall look on him whom they pierced". Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus came and took the body of Jesus from the cross and, having wrapped it in linen, laid it in a garden.

Only after all this, John left the side of the Master and went home.

If we glanced over the later life of St. John the Apostle until his death we should see his love for his Divine Master gradually increasing together with his faith in Christ as the only Saviour of men on our sinful earth, Who for ever stands knocking at the door of our hearts, patiently waiting that we may open and admit the Dear Guest into our home (Rev. 3:20).

In my thought, the surest way to the Union, of which we all write and speak so much of late, is the way trodden by St. John the Apostle. All who enter this path will be freed from the iron shackles which prevent us at present from considering the problem with simplicity. He who treads this way will find all kinds of difficulties and obstacles, historical, archaeological and national, melting away before him.

He who loves Christ in the real sense, not fancifully, or mistakenly, will also love his brother, filling his brother also with responsive love. John the Apostle even thought that it is impossible to love God without first loving our brother. And he who loves his brother shall be one with Him, shall be in God. Remember: God is love, and love is the source of brotherhood and unity.

Lay Religion

By Principal Forsyth, M.A., D.D.,
Hackney College, Hampstead, London.

With the spread of democracy, and in the democratic Churches especially, Christianity has been growing more and more of a lay religion. And more and more it must grow a lay religion. Only let us be clear and careful what we mean by the word.

The Reformation would never have taken place without a lay religion, or, if it had taken place, it could never have lasted. Theologians as such could never have carried it through; and the theologians who did carry it did so not as theologians but as sinners saved by grace. In so far as that experience is theological they were theologians; but they were penitents first. It was not theological truth as a branch of science that they sought, it was the truth of salvation. Their theology was the pursuit of salvation as truth. They were the devotees not of systematic truth but of saving truth. Certainly they did not become reformers either in the interest or in the power of the scholastic theology, much of it as they carried with them. It was as a conscience, *i.e.* as a layman, that Luther was saved, neither as a monk nor as a theologian. He was a mystic of the conscience.

For some centuries prior to the Reformation a lay type of piety had been developing in the Church. It was a type which had not much direct or experimental interest in the dogmatic system of the Church, but simply took it, with a *fides implicita*, as the basement of the institution, whose life came to them along another line, either mystical or ethical. Numbers of people, both in and out

of the monasteries, lived upon a mystic piety, which was cultivated beyond the theological schools, which took expression in some fine literature, and which constantly tended to gather into groups, or even sects, more or less intractable to the statutory authority of the Church. It was not Protestantism that began the making of sects. The orders were sects which the Church had the wisdom to regularize. They arose in the Church from the failure of thorough reform, and they made the soil in which the Reformation grew—as is suggested by the great influence on the early Luther of one of the chief products of this kind of piety, the *Theologia Germania*. It was the souls bred upon religion of this stamp, and not the sceptics, humanist or other, that found the hierarchy and its type of religion so intolerable. They did not live upon the Church's dogma but on the Bible and on the religious continuity of Christian experience. How far that continuity might be dependent on the dogma at bottom is not our question here, as it was not theirs. Their ruling desire was for more *intimacy* of Christian life than the Church had come to provide, either in souls or between them. But so much may be said as this. It was found when the Reformation was on its feet that such piety could not be sustained without a theology, and without much more theology than mysticism cared for. Even Boehme had in his theosophy an elaborate theology, though it was upon an intuitional basis rather than a historic. Historic Christianity supplied him with a scheme rather than a foundation. In any case his mysticism is too theological, as well as too ethical, for mystical taste today, which seizes on his intuitive rather than his positive side. But leaving that for the moment, we may mark that high mysticism was not the whole of the lay note. We must keep in view also the action on the public of the confessional, the preaching orders, the many religious fraternities—all of which promoted a religion more intimate and real than the schools did, and more ethical than the

mystics often were. Mysticism of one kind may mean little of a moral tax, and may even be a spiritual luxury. In cases it seems to shun the moral note, and become the cult of a coterie. Even in its more Christian and less monistic forms it may mean but expatiating in the spiritual personality of Christ, without His historic Redemption, and His moral judgment unto salvation.

But one way and another these elements prepared for the Reformation a great mass of lay sympathy. The Reformation was really the eruptive summit of a long ascent of popular religion of a more or less personal and intimate kind. The Reformers were floated off by it (if the figure may be changed). It is true that once they were afloat on it they had before long to draw out of the turbulent waters, and make for a mooring whence they saw the violent current of Anabaptist sectarianism and the peasant revolt dash over the falls of spiritualistic socialism. Popular spiritualism is no fit type of Christianity for the control of history. It loses too soon its hold on the conscience; which hold indeed cannot be kept even by the Christian morality of the Sermon on the Mount, but only by such treatment of the conscience as is involved in its new creation, the new Humanity, by the evangelical principles of the Cross—forgiveness, conversion, justification, and the new birth. The mystic element and the ethical are alike essential to Christian faith; but they receive their true place only as they combine on a higher plane in the evangelical re-creation of the conscience by the Holy. The conscience, the guilty conscience, its release and its renovation in Christ alone—that is the true universal, the true moral mysticism, the true laicism of religion, the doom of all priests or experts that press beyond an intercessory or intermediary to a mediatorial place. That was what was really central to the lay religion which made the dawn of the Reformation. Its mysticism in the masses was penitential; it gathered

about the sense of sin and the curse of self, and not the mere aspirations or intuitions of the spiritual nature. The practical religion of the Church and its ordinances, especially the confessional and penance, had made the treatment of the conscience the great need, which yet the Church as an institution could not meet. It had still the power to kindle a thirst it could not quench. Its sacramental system was inadequate to its prophetic word. The apostolic succession was not equal to its apostolic call. It urged the need of an absolution it could not really give, and it made men crave for a grace which its conception of grace could not convey. Its sacramental grace could not produce the New Testament fruits of grace; it could not infuse personal goodness but only status, not soul certainty but only individual security. All its absolving ordinances only deepened the hunger for a real remission. And the closing part of the middle ages was doing everything to deepen the question they could not meet—"Where is real forgiveness to be found? How shall communion with God really be restored?" This became the one central issue of the Reformers, and the point from which they started the reconstruction of the whole of Christianity. They answered the question with the simple Gospel of the grace and mercy of God once for all in Christ, carried direct to the soul by the Word of Gospel and the witness of the Spirit. This, they said, was the effective thing in pulpit and sacrament. But that was what the best of the pre-Reformation mystics did not clearly see. The Gospel for them was but a new phase of law—the law of love, the precept of Christ, the refined *habitus* of Christ, the spirit of Christ, the imitation of Christ. In so far the lay religion in the Church was not Christianity; it was only a protest against the materialism and the institutionalism that the Church had come to, and a call for its renovation by a new spirituality which might or might not be the Gospel. Nothing can be a lay religion really Christian which does not give the guilty

conscience final peace with God direct from Christ and His atoning Cross.

One of the reasons why we fail at this moment to appreciate the answer of the Reformation to its age is that our own age is not putting the question the Reformers faced. It is not asking how its sin may be forgiven, but how its sympathies may be cultivated, its intuition developed, and its wrongs set right. We are on the track of the social revolution, and not of the religious Reformation. When we speak of religious liberty people mean oftener the citizen's freedom to hold any religion or none than the soul's freedom and confidence with God. And the reality which appeals to the lay mind today is not that which comes home to its troubled conscience in a ministry of redemption, but in the culture of character and the ministries of public reform and social service. It cares more for the brotherhood of man than for the communion of saints, and if it do think of communion it drops its pitch to comradeship. Fraternity, with its sympathy, takes the place of the household of faith as an obedience, a duty, and a worship; with such an ironical result as we see when labour in its just battle with capital yet so wages the war as to own no duty to society, and is even prepared to destroy it, in the impatient pursuit of a class ideal lawful enough in itself but not justifying, in peasant any more than in peer, a warfare in which the chief sufferers are the most innocent and the most needy. What is that but the principle now made dreadful in the Great War? The question of the hour for the Church is whether its great contribution to meet the social need at last is not the same Gospel as the Reformers had to declare. It cost them the masses. For the sake of the Gospel and its prime society of the Church they had to see in religious circles the devotees of the spirit and the ideal plunge away from the control of the Word; while the social revolt rushed from their side, and even forced them into a shameful antagonism. Humanist culture meanwhile was either

reabsorbed in the old Church, or drawn into the communities of the inner light.

The Anabaptists who survived the Teutonic savagery of that day escaped to the toleration of Holland, from whence they exerted a great influence on England. It was in England, and in Independency, that the valuable element in Anabaptism and its popular movements came to itself, the spiritualistic and ethical element, the element less institutional and more intimate, being stiffened by Calvinism, it cast off the wild features which wrecked it abroad—though even in England it cost a king his head, and a dynasty its life. But out of the English convulsion grew what the continent could not produce—constitutional liberty. And this was the work both of the Reformation and of the Co-Reformation, the result of mating Calvin's power with Karlstadt's note, a positive gospel with a free spirit, on constitutional lines. And so today our hope is, as our English genius is, that social reform will obviate the necessity for social revolt; and that the Church will never be compelled to save its life by having to harden its face in the presence of revolution and its sterilities. It is a false and non-Christian laicity which sacrifices justification by faith to justice by law, and hopes from the improvement of society the regeneration of the race. The best that has been done in the world, and especially in Anglo-Saxondom, for public justice has been done by those who were bred under the shadow of Churches made by justifying grace. Such was the Cromwellian spirit. Such was the political liberalism of the Victorian age. And a powerful and popular religion must always have that kind of mystic element strong in it; it need not buy its lay strength at the cost of the evangelical conscience, history, doctrine, ministry, or Church.

It was the very essence of the Reformation that Christianity should become a lay religion. Christianity was taken out of the control of a priestly caste, and placed in

the hands of every believer as a priestly man through the priestly Christ. But this involved a certain theology, especially in connection with the conditions of this new priesthood. Now all theology then had upon it the "way" of the old scholasticism; for it was a moral and religious bondage that the Reformation broke, and not a theological. Hence, before a century was over, the new religion had to be rescued for the layman from another bondage—from the theologian. The mediaeval sway of the theologian had surged back on Protestantism, and submerged its first inspiration—only now rallying upon an infallible book instead of an infallible Church, and upon a necessary system of pure doctrine drawn from the book. So faith had now to be rescued from its own truth. The first sources of this second rescue, this more popular laicity, were what is known as the Pietist movement in Germany, and the Evangelical movement in this country. Pietism was much more popular in its appeal than the Reformation, which, after all, seized on the princes and powers rather than the masses of the people. By Pietism the orthodox theology was retained in the main—just as in the main mediaeval theology was retained by Luther—but it was cast into a secondary place —a place secondary to warm experience. And by experience was meant a positive and daily sense of a gospel of regenerative forgiveness, and a new creation to Eternal Life. It was an experience distinctly supernatural, not native to the soul as soul, nor common to all men. It was more than religious, more than spiritual. It turned on a real transition, a real regeneration from death to life, from guilt to grace. It was the evangelical experience, as not only open but necessary to every soul, and imperative especially to every conscience. It was the Protestantism of the new birth. And it was lay because it went to the conscience which makes man man; and to the sinful conscience which has made man's history what it has been. For, first, no man could say he had not

sinned; and, second, the Gospel was at once the demand and the boon of a God in Whose revelation holiness deepened the sin that love destroyed everywhere.

The Reformation lost the masses in losing the social revolution of its day. But it lost them for the sake of the Word of Gospel, which it felt to be the ulterior condition of a new society. And evangelical Pietism was the first step it took to recover that loss, and to laicize itself into the popular experience.

But the reference of religion to lay experience had also taken another and very different direction. Modern Protestantism has been as much affected by the rise of the sects as by the reformation of the Church, though it is the latter that has monopolized notice, owing to its effect on the national Church. But (as I have said, here and elsewhere) the Free Churches and all they have meant for the Western world owe as much to the sects which made the Co-Reformation as to the Reformation itself.[1] It was the spiritual sects, known crudely as Anabaptist, that carried the Christian appeal of the new time past the princes and powers of the Reformation to the masses of the people—the new sects with their intimate religion, their warm fraternities, and their tendency to lay stress on subjective love rather than objective truth. But the sects in England had so much of the Calvinist stiffening that they held fast to that objective truth and final deed in historic Christianity which creates the Church. Hence as they grew, they grew into Churches. But, on the other side, as they lose that sense of an objective, the sects, instead of rising to be Churches, subside into groups, rationalist or mystic; and today, having run through the stages of Church and sect, we are entering an age of mystic groups, which seem to many a lay mind more simple, religious, and sacred.

The spiritualists outside the Reformation fell into two very different classes. There were those who, like Frank

[1] See my *Faith, Freedom and the Future* (Hodder & Stoughton).

or Weigel, started from the spirituality of human nature if it got a fair chance, and those like Karlstadt or Schwenkfeld who started from a human nature regenerated in Christ, though they threw off the ban of an institutional orthodoxy in interpreting that fact. The two sections branched widely apart, according as the inner light was held to be nature rarefied or to be nature regenerate. The evangelical side had its effect in Pietism, and it worked strongly also in Holland and in England, as I have said. But the rationalist side was effective no less. Following Frank, appeal was made to human nature not as the culprit but as the judge, not to man as either sinful, incapable, or miserable, but to man as man, to healthy human nature at its best, sure of itself and its higher powers. For the first time the idea of Humanity came to play a serious part in connexion with Christianity. In due course Lessing in Germany and Rousseau in France introduced, the one a rational and ethical Humanity, the other a sentimental, as the standard to which religion must be brought, where its claims must be measured, and its aims defined. The Illumination was the rational counterpart of Pietism. It was the reference of Christianity, not now to a supernatural experience of guilt and salvation, but to a logical sense of truth, and to a natural experience of justice and kindness. The layman now put in charge of religion was not the man everywhere whose troubled conscience found the peace of a new life in Christ alone, but the man everywhere whose conscience had a native nobility, whose natural faculties could weigh evidence, whose spiritual temperament took the mystic way, or whose genial heart could respond to an ideal of love and hope with an innate religiosity. Religion became a flush on the face of philosophy or idealism, a light from heaven upon the humane or domestic affections, or it was an inspiration and sanction for natural liberty, equality, or fraternity—especially fraternity. It became a sympathy or a pity consecrating a natural optimism,

and trusting nature in general, and human nature in particular. For thought, though not for the public, this cheery creed received a death blow from the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755. But it did not die on the day it was killed. It is not dead yet. Only that we are more prone to speak today of a natural, or an unconscious, Christianity than of natural religion.

This was laicizing religion in a sense quite different from anything contemplated by the Reformation, which rested the lay faith on the equal priesthood of all believers, or even by the evangelical spiritualists. These anchored on the New Humanity created from Heaven; but the Illumination, and many of the mystics, stood on the Old Humanity, only transfigured in Christ, or promoted by Him. The two movements have, as to their origin, little or nothing in common. The one did not grow out of the other; it was its rival. The new faith in human nature grew out of the Renaissance and the Humanism with which the Reformation had to part company—in some ways to its loss, but really for its life. But the Illumination and its Humanity much affected the type of evangelical Christianity; and at the present moment it has even thrust it into the background.

The two types of religion—Christ as natural, excellent, amiable, rational Humanity spiritualized, and Christ as holy, God incarnate—Christ as Humanity ascending, and Christ as God descending, Christ as Humanity attaining and Christ as God redeeming—these two types could not, of course, be without affinities grounded in the nature of the soul, where all religion resides. Both make their appeal to experience, to a spiritual psychology, and even to an ethical standard. Both are forms of lay religion in so far that they are not religions of priestly authority *ab extra*. They appeal to some authority within. But they construe that authority with such a world of difference as lies in the experience of the new Birth. And while both have the lay note in demanding of a Gospel

that it shall work, the one makes its first work to be the restoration of a lost peace and energy with God by His redeeming grace, while the other makes it to be but the growth of a communion never really lost, or its repair in so far as it had been but damaged. In the one case everything turns on a final historic act in Christ's cross, realized in the guilty and grateful experience of age after age; in the other case all turns on an experience prime within each soul and classic in Christ, but without *necessary* reference to the historic cross, or even the historic Jesus. In the one case the cross has absolute value for history, in the other it has a value but relative and utilitarian. For the latter, Jesus, having made His ideals the property of the race, might retire. Or His existence might be denied; while the fable of Him would still rank as a valuable illusion, acting but as the down which floated the ideal seed through the atmosphere of time to fructify in the soil of history.

It is not to be denied that the less evangelical form offers strong attractions. It seems humane and simple, and appears to do more than the other to make every man capable of a responsible judgment on the essence of religion and every man free of the expert, theological or sacerdotal. Its great obstacle now as then is history. It is the New Testament, and the Catholic experience the New Testament has created in the Church!

The keynote of such forms of "lay religion" would seem to lie in dogmatic simplicity, humanness, intimacy with the nearest affections and the spiritualities, as these might be construed by excellent, practical, and public-minded people, with wide religious sympathies, little spiritual experience, and indifferent theological education. Religion is stripped of the difficulty, the effort, the conflict, the passion, the tragedy, the poignancy that gather about a degenerate conscience, a lost soul, or a lost world. It is the religion of the sane and healthy mind, which cultivates liberalism in theology as the application to that

subject of good sense, good feeling, historical sympathy, and all the methods and sympathies that mark liberal culture generally. It appeals to a piety cultivated either outside the Bible, or on those parts of it, selected by some subjective affinity or spiritual taste, which would form "the literary man's Bible"; only not on the Bible as a redemptive whole, as, above all, the history and the shrine of Redemption. It addresses itself to a piety detached from a unique and revolutionary experience of the whole man, divorced therefore from doctrine as the key of history, and from thought as an essential constituent of religion. It is not sure that the plan of creation is the principle of salvation, or that the world's goal is the Kingdom of God. Thought is connected with religion but as one of its interests for those whose hobby lies that way. It is a piety to be pursued in the more leisured, refined, or genial hours of life, when we take a rest from the energies or the altruisms that ought really to engross our more strenuous time. It knows nothing of what used to be called the "gracious affections", but only of the humane; and it tends to think that the only exercise of the love of God is in loving action to man, without energies like prayer, or communion, in which man for the time is forgotten. It is the delightful piety of the hearth, of the social graces, of the fine intention, the magnetic spell, the charming way, the ready sympathy, the humanitarian programme, and the helping hand, on the level of the day's interest, the current book, or the daily press—not unintelligent, but yet accessible only to what is directly and simply said, and to nothing that lies behind. It is the religion of people who read and are impressed, but who do not ponder the last things, nor agonize at the strait gate. Or it is the religion of less cultured classes who have no terminology for their religion but the ordinary human sympathies. It is really in the end an aesthetic religion more than a religion of the conscience.

It is a type of religion indicated by the current taste in preaching. This is preaching that says everything, that does not impress you with unspeakable reserves, that has not Eternity in its heart. It is lucid, facile, and passionless. It opens no dark doors, lets in no awful sounds, hears from beyond the last river no harpers on celestial harps, has no scars of the moral tragedy and its moral conquest. It has not been in hell. But many echoes of pure love are in it, many winsome ways, and many tender touches upon the elemental pities and pieties. It has a special appeal to cultivated women. It is simple, not in the sense that it lights, unifies, and pacifies the whole world, but in the sense that it makes the least call upon those who hear, and most upon hearers who know nothing of a world-trouble. It is perhaps more easy than simple. It seems at times more concerned to adapt the Gospel than to preach its fulness, to bring it down to the people's level than to bring them up to it. It does not presuppose habitual use of the Bible, or any solitary experience of the greater sort. Passion and greatness it discards, but its style may have the secret of the happy touch and the just word. It presupposes religion (which is a natural thing) rather than faith as the apostles would have understood the word (which is not a natural thing but a supernatural). It seeks rather to commend the Gospel to the natural man than to set the natural man in the searchlight of the Gospel. It would avoid theology rather than develop it, or translate it, or apply it; for it does not reach those deep levels of the moral soul where the ore is got from which the great theologies were cast in a furnace. It aims at the healthy minded who may suffer from the ills to which life is heir, and for whom sin is, at worst, a disease they have caught rather than a guilt they have incurred. Words or experiences like Atonement or Justification are shunned or emptied. The Cross is welcome as the glory of the old Humanity rather than the creator of the new. The vital connexion of for-

giveness with eternal life, and of both with the atoning Cross, is regarded as dogmatics. Which if it is, those who so preach it are, without doubt, obtruding into the pulpit in a pedantic way the branch of religious science which is their personal hobby, as the partisan thrusts his politics on all companies, or as the provincial diner-out expects the capital to welcome vernacular tales. It is not allowed that that connexion is the distinctive feature of historic Christianity; which to treat as mere theology is to turn the article of our salvation over to a guild of theological experts, and in principle to place the secret of the new life in the hands of a specialized order. It is to put the soul in commission into the hands of a priesthood of theologians; and it were better to have left it with a priesthood of the altar.

The word "lay" had clearly a different meaning once from what it now wears. It stood for directness of access by every guilty and penitent conscience to the Saviour. It meant deep but direct faith and life in Him alone; it now means average religion. It did mean the simplicity we rise to in Christ, it now means the simplicity to which Christ descends in us. It did mean the religion of a minority anointed by God not man; it now means the religion of the majority of those who can be interested in Christianity, or even religion. It did mean a spiritual relation to Christ, it now means an ethical quality like Christ's. It was "in Christ", it now is "like Christ".

It used to mean the ethic of Atonement, now it is but that of attunement, or even attainment. It once meant trust in Christ, the one Saviour of history; it now means the use of Christ as the greatest symbol in history. It once referred everything to the facts of Gospel history, it now refers even these to an eternal human necessity, which finds progressive expression in the most general and spiritual ideas of the religious soul slowly emerging through the symbols of time. It did mean the equal

dependence of every believing soul not simply on Christ's person but on the decisive act of that person, and of history, in Christ's cross; it now means that every soul who takes religion seriously at all makes his own atonement, and has his salvation in an inner process which is self-redemptive—redemptive and sufficient by its own penitent nature, without necessary reference to anything Christ did. In the one case it was an equal and immediate relation to Christ the only Saviour, in the other it tends to be the graded relation of a host of christs to the Arch-Christ. Lay religion used to mean a practical faith in every soul's equal need of grace, and his direct and supernatural relations with Christ as Saviour; it is coming to mean something different—the need of grace only for some special sinners, and for all men the equal and brotherly relation of Christ to the natural soul as its higher self, its ideal, or its helper. He is at most the Christ in Whom Humanity is constituted rather than redeemed, from whom we can not be cut off however false, and whose grace is the realization of human nature rather than its will's new creation. The old layman demanded depth at any cost, for which he was willing to pay the inward price and meet the preacher half way; the new demands simplicity at no cost at all, and will have everything brought, cooked and flavoured, to his door. Simplicity for him is not what clears a concerned conscience, but it is what speaks the language of his business or consecrates the voice of his bosom. It is the Gospel deposited at his private address, without effort of his, for family use; it is not a Gospel which he travels miles of spiritual preparation to hear, and which might cost father, mother, wife, or child. He does not dig for it as for hid treasure—the ministry is there for that purpose, in the preparing of sermons. And the ministry fails because it either has to dig alone, or it is discouraged to do more than hoe the ground, and then it finds nothing to make it more than a carrier and turn it to a prophet. In church-

going many hope at most to be impressed, and at least to have a treat: what they fear is to be humiliated—broken up, cast down, taught an obedience, frightened about their soul, and born again. Theirs is a cordial faith rather than a joyful—as the New Testament understands joy. It is a faith of the heart rather than the conscience, a faith in sunny Love rather than solemn Grace. In so far as it is of the conscience it is more a matter of conduct than of sanctity, of moral habit rather than of moral regeneration in the Cross. It is a religion which moves people to go and do or help something; all the religion that makes them despair of their doing is antiquarian and immoral orthodoxy, a morbidity self-induced by too much theology or Biblicism. It tends to import the things that are of first value in business into the first place in religion, just as business people are prone to attach exclusive importance in morals to the pecuniary conscience. It is apt therefore to think and say, with emphasis and finality, that in religion character is everything—which for Christianity it is not. Faith is everything—and indeed, when we come even to business itself, we find it is really credit that matters, whatever the private character may be.

In close connexion with this overbalance to the conduct side, or to the sympathetic, is the tendency (which seems spiritual) to take an indifferent if not negative attitude to official and organized religion, to a Church as more than a group. We have the crude collision between subjectivism and institutionalism, between radicalism and history, intuition and tradition. This is parallel to the stress laid on the character of Christ, at the cost of the office and work in which the whole Saviour took complete effect. The brother Christ, the excellent Christ, or the Christ ideal, becomes more than the Redeemer. We sit lightly to anything more in the Cross than supreme self-sacrifice, to anything described by the old phrase "the work of Christ", to anything of its action upon a holy God. Hence, from this failure to grasp the objective

element in faith, comes a religion more or less Churchless and non-sacramental. It is apt to see in Baptism a domestic occasion, or a dedication at most, which can quite well take place at the home; and in the Lord's supper only a memorial feast or rite. The Church is but religious association, with less meaning or life on the whole than a brotherhood. Brother is identified with neighbour as in the New Testament it is not; it is defined by natural Humanity, where in the New Testament it means the household of regenerate faith, and the kinship of the Holy Spirit. The love of the brethren means nothing more sacred than the love and help of our nearest neighbours (truly a very sacred thing). A man uses his rights in the Church in just the independent and stalwart spirit in which he would claim and use them in any other democratic body, without an unearthly spiritual atmosphere or control. He is indifferent to a Gospel of positive truth (which he calls theological) so long as the preacher can magnetize an audience, fill the building, or provide public interest.

There is nothing causing more concern to the overseers of the flock than the way in which the sons of families that once were pillars of some church retire from interest and concern in its affairs and creed, while maintaining a general sympathy with religion, an interest in the more obvious religious questions, a valuable public activity, a vigorous philanthropy, or a high minded style of business. They are admirable men but Bible and Church they can simply do without, on the strength of a kind of religion which seems more actual and simple, and which they would often describe in our phrase as "lay religion", distinct from that of the parsons, the Churches, or the Creeds. There is some prospect however that the public events of the time may have a modifying effect on this type of religion, and may drive some to a deeper creed and a franker confession of it—though there are, no doubt, many on whom they will have quite a contrary effect.

It may have been felt that there is no feature of "lay religion" more conspicuous or more distinctive than its impatience of paradox, and its consequent tendency to platitude. What it means by a simple religion is not quite a religion stripped of theological intricacy; it is a religion without a fundamental catastrophe and crisis in the moral world, without moral tragedy, fatal collision, or spiritual passion. Of course, in so far as paradox is but the sparkle of wit, its mere ingenious wrist-play, and fantastic topsy-turveydom, it is but a piece of intellectual irritation when turned on such subjects; and one has much sympathy with the bewilderment of the straight and serious Anglo-Saxon. But the paradox of a world of agony and a God of love, of a guilty world and a holy grace, of the suffering of the best, of the holiest feeling the worst, of "die to live", the paradox of the Cross—that is not mere paradox; it is the region of moral miracle. It must be at the heart of any religion where sentiment or moralism has not destroyed the tragic note. To believe religiously in God, indeed, need not be a paradox; it may be a ready and smooth intuition. But to believe in the God of Christ, of Love, of Grace, and at the same time to have a keen and real sense of such a world of grief, guilt, horror, goodness, and glory as we live in, is a paradox, and the great paradox of existence. It is a miracle, a triumph of grace, to believe with open eyes amid such a world as surrounds us now. And it is only possible by a theodicy of some kind, religious or rational; which therefore is not simply a condition of great religion, nor a luxury of it, but its very nature, its quality. But such theology is just what lay religion, in the modern sense of the term, is so shy of. The great and permanent advantage of evangelical faith is the courage and thoroughness of its principle. Its theology may be at points very vulnerable and out of date, but it does not extenuate. It does face the lions in the path. It does gauge the evil in the world. It does seek to rest wholly on a theodicy on

the world scale, on the eternal scale. Its justification of man does rest on a very needful self-justification of God in the face of such a world, and in the Cross of His Son. It is much concerned to secure the welfare and salvation of men because it is supremely concerned to secure (as the Cross secures) the absolute and universal holiness of God. It does not resent and repudiate the paradox of the moral world, but it resolves it in the reconcilement of which the Cross of Christ, as the core of Christianity, is the efficient ground and not the mere impressive manifestation.

In brief, lay Christianity in its recent phase tends to be substantially Illuminationist and Judaic. It is a general belief in the Fatherhood of God conceived in terms of natural affection or sane piety. It has a valuable interest in the subjective religion of Jesus, which, however, it throws into a strong contrast with all views which place the centre of gravity for His person in His act of the Cross. It is a highly sympathetic form of rational religion, which does not in essence go farther than an enlightened and deritualized Judaism of the Hillel type, singing the sunnier psalms and reciting the Lord's Prayer. In so far it is thus not advanced but ancient.

Yet let us be just, which is to be hopeful. The old Judaism was the *nidus* of Christianity. The temple was the forecourt of the Church. The prophets passed into the Apostles, the Rabbis into the pastors and theologians. And much of the lay religion I describe as Judaist is so fine and pious that out of it must come something greater than it dreams, a very vital impulse amid that inner dulness of the conventional which is more deadly to Christianity than any antagonism or persecution from the world. A live heresy is far better than a dead orthodoxy. I would take Wernle and Rittelmeyer as brilliant exponents of a liberal theology which is not so satisfied with itself but that it can deplore its own inability to create life as powerfully as it can order thought, and can own

the power of the old style to convert as the new style can not do.

For purposes of reconstruction, such as are served by this QUARTERLY, two things are needful—first, a clear grasp of the conflicting positions which dissolve the old synthesis, and, second, a sympathetic grasp of the positive and approximative movement within each.

First we should be clear and explicit as to the lines of cleavage. There is no sound unity possible without a thorough understanding of the obstacles. Do not let us muffle the issue. It is easy of course to say that this tends to accentuate difference, and that we should not dwell on it. This is a facile mistake, and it is the mistake made by some who have the restoration of Church unity much at heart. But we all have it much at heart; the difficulty is with the head, or with the conscience. It concerns certain beliefs which are held to form a trust from God upon Christian people. Now to hush up these is a wrong policy. They can not be slighted or huddled away. It is better to accentuate them than to do that. The line of progress goes through our theological difficulties and not round them. It is a course that takes more time and toil, but it is the only one that arrives. The first requisite for Church unity is not an emulsion but a readjustment of the beliefs without which a Church can not be. Some differences will be adjusted by a united Church but some of the gravest must be adjusted that the Church may unite. And we should treat some differences as doctors rather than nurses, frankly, if not incisively, with some of our sympathy spared to understand the case to the bottom. Let us know just where we are. What are the exact incompatibilities? Let no one think that it is obstructive or destructive work to set these forth. No reconstruction is sound without it.

But always on the understanding that we do not stop there. That means but a deadlock. For many it would

be easy to leave the matter at that point of mere elucidation, to present a dilemma, and to call for choice. Their interest is but controversial, or let us rather say polemical; for all our best truth has arisen out of controversy, which to the strong is a very noble thing. Well, it is necessary at a point to offer a dilemma and call for choice. But the ruling interest is not polemical, any more than it is merely ironical. Let us understand each other in a common passion to understand the subject. The no-compromise attitude may not be always sterile, but it is mostly. And therefore we must recognize, in the second place, that the opposing positions are not simply statical but dynamic. They do not just grind each other's face. They do not gorgonize each other with a stony stare. Each is in itself a living and changing thing. In each is a growing movement of its own. Only part of its effort is collision. It develops its own principles, its own strength. It makes in a certain direction. Internal changes go on on each side. Orthodoxy and heresy which merely grind each other's face are barren, and can become vulgar. We need not speak of the sciolists, but in the best cases each is really concerned for the truth, and for a living truth which is a growing truth. Hard orthodoxy and hard heresy are now left behind. On both sides there are going on inevitable modifications and *rapprochements*. These are not so much in the way of compromise as in the way of native development. If the hardshell orthodoxy has broken down the hardshell heresy is breaking up. By which I mean breaking open. I mean that it is taking a larger form, and working upward and outward to a view of things which meets a corresponding movement from the other side. Heresy deepens and orthodoxy broadens. For orthodoxy also is not what it was. Criticism for instance is now a much more serious thing by its scientific method than it was in the old amateur days of the clever fellow who unsettled people with excursions on the self-contradictions of Scripture and

Providence. The critical treatment of the New Testament has made so much fresh contribution to the understanding of Christ's character and teaching that His person becomes to many a living moral reality such as the theologies of His office had stifled. On the other hand, the theology of Christ's office has itself become moralized and linked up more closely with His person and His personal religion. The work of Christ is a work of the holy and loving conscience which made His person both Godward and manward. It is the necessary self-expression in love of the Holy. And it is the crisis of the whole moral tragedy of history, not to say of Eternity. It is the consummation of the moral order, and not a mere device to escape from it. On the modern side is developed a new moral sensibility which, deepening, becomes alive to world issues that demand more than a martyrdom in the Cross. On the other side is also developed a moral insight which, widening, integrates the Cross at the summit or centre of the moral movements of the universe, of which it is yet not the symbol merely but the source. The royalty of Christ becomes better realized on both sides, and they grow more ready to recognize that He was not only a King who died but that He died as King. That by way of illustration.

And I would add to such considerations one that comes home specially on my own side of the Atlantic just now. If the new school do not take evil seriously enough, the old did not take history. And the effect of the vast and awful tragedy of Europe (where some in the trenches find in St. Paul what they once found in poetry) is to deepen the sense of the inveteracy of evil, to reduce somewhat our belief in human nature and sharpen the need of Grace, to make more room in our Christian theology for the idea of judgment, and to raise that idea from a sectarian, or theological, or spectacular thing to a thing national, ecumenical, and moral. The more solemn themes of the old theology receive a new actuality and

a new consecration. At the same time the quick sensibility and moral sympathy of the newer schools break up not only the easy optimisms of speculation but the moral flatness, not to say stodginess, of much traditional belief. That belief, as I say, had become too far detached from the moral issues that rule living history, and the Cross it preached suffered in consequence. It became the palladium of an elect instead of the tragic crisis of a world.

I would be understood, therefore, while setting out the antitheses of the two types, to indicate that they each change and move to each other by a logic moral and spiritual, which ever controls the *process* of an abstract theology by the living *action* of a theology imminent to faith and concrete with life on the largest and least individual scale.

War and Missions

By Joseph Schmidlin, D.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Münster, Westphalia.

"The failure of Christianity and the bankruptcy of the Churches"—thus has been described in this organ the war which is still raging. There is doubtless much exaggeration in this gloomy picture. The war has set free many activities beneficent even from a religious and Christian point of view. In both camps it has aroused many from their materialism and has led them back to Christian idealism. Interest in the war and participation in it is for many rooted in the noblest motives of duty and truth. In spite of and along with all the horrors that always accompany armed force, there are still unshakably enthroned many Christian principles, not only in theory which criticises excess but also in the practice of individuals and of States. It can not be denied, however, that the war has either destroyed or perceptibly injured a number of Christian possessions and ideals, and among those undertakings which have been partly destroyed, partly endangered, Christian foreign missions hold a leading place.

How near did one believe the Golden Age of Missions to be, just before the outbreak of the war!—that time when only with the weapons of the Spirit and of love we should struggle, not against our own brothers in the faith, not against the adherents of other confessions, not even against the heathen themselves, but against heathen cruelty and error. All Christendom seemed to have set forth as one upon this eminently peaceful warfare, and in the face of such a gigantic task even

the inner antagonisms began to be silenced. The Christian mission had become world evangelization in the strongest sense of that word; humanity seemed to be divided in but two camps, the missionary Christian world and the heathen world to be evangelized.

Then God—the same God whose world kingdom we would extend and for whose world mission we would prepare the way—sent us the world war, for the first time a veritable world war which drew into its whirlpool the nearest and the most distant, the Christian and the heathen peoples. And alas! not as in former wars, which had opened so many doors for missions, did the Christian peoples stand drawn up against the non-Christian, but the destiny of war hurled us all in confusion: arm in arm with England marches Japan, which by its Buddhistic demands upon China has placed itself at the forefront of heathenism; and on the side of Germany is fighting Turkish Islam, whose Holy War was in other times always directed against the Christian power. Yes, what has never been heard of before, heathen and Mohammedan allies are led by Christians to war against fellow-Christians on the battlefields of Europe, and the colonies witnessed the strange drama in which Christians crossed swords with one another, even drew the black heathen into their fratricide.

Thus at one blow is discarded the whole foundation of missions, Christian solidarity. How frequently and how shamefully have been violated and trodden under foot the precepts and the spirit of the Gospel which preaches to unbelievers as the message of our faith the love of all humanity and the love of Christ! Have not the enemies of the cross every reason to mock and to jeer at such a lamentable fiasco? Will they not unite more closely than ever to resist the Christian world religion? And will not Christianity be compelled to sheath its mission sword, shamed and maimed by the inner discord which in its hate has transgressed all the precepts

of Christendom and betrayed all Christian interests to the heathen world?

But the present war has gone still further in its work of destruction. It not only undermines and shatters the ideal foundations of missionary stability, but it rages against them directly and plucks their most beautiful flowers. German missions, Catholic as well as Protestant, received the first and severest blow at home as well as in the mission field, in the German and non-German colonies. The missionary institutions at home were depopulated because of the call to arms, and were claimed for the care of the sick, their activities destroyed, their finances shattered, and their preparations checked. German mission fields were on the one hand cut off completely from the home base and thus robbed of their support, and on the other exposed to hostile attacks and their continuance threatened. Contrary to the Congo Act, which sought to keep the terrors of war from Africa and especially from its missions, the fate of German colonial missions has been delivered to the caprice of the fortunes of war. While those in the largest German colony in East Africa have been until now generally spared from the war fury, thanks to the successful defence of the protected territory, those in the German Southwest, Togo and the coast province of Kamerun, have fallen into the enemy's hands, not without being involved in severe suffering. In the German Southwest also missionaries of both confessions were carried away as prisoners, and in Togo their work was hindered in many ways. On the other hand, the German South Sea missions seem not to have been really molested when their territory was occupied, either by the Australians in New Guinea and the New Zealanders in Samoa, or by the Japanese in the Marshall Islands, the Carolines, and the Marianas. While Catholic and Protestant missions in Tsingtau and Kiautschou have suffered under the Japanese invasion and conquest,

their injuries may in some measure have been already repaired, although they have not recovered again full freedom for their activities.

Beyond the region of German protection the fortunes of German associations and missions have been very diverse. In neutral lands, especially in China, they have suffered at most only from the economic reaction of the war; in Japan, too, they have been absolutely unmolested and even enjoy civil protection. England's treatment of German missionaries is certainly not uniform. On the one hand we see missionaries, even those who are no longer of an age for military service, shut up in concentration camps, forbidden to do any missionary work: thus in India there are more than a hundred missionaries of both confessions in the prison camp at Ahmednagar, most of them even in the severest and worst camp "A," in which otherwise only the most dangerous subjects are confined; in Ceylon, at Deyakalawa; in South Africa at Pietermaritzburg. On the other hand, they are allowed to work in practical freedom, as on the Gold Coast whose Governor has given an illuminating example of tolerance, or they remain simply under a light civil constraint as in British Borneo, while those in Hongkong have been expelled.

Next to the German, the French missions have suffered most from the war (the Catholics to much the greater extent) principally through the extension of mobilization even to the mission priests who as such were at other times freed from normal military service. As a consequence, not only have the mission houses at home been completely emptied, but the best and most necessary strength has been withdrawn from the foreign mission fields. So we see at one move 60 French missionaries hastening to the war from Japan, from China more than 200, from Farther India 26, and again 50, from Pondicherry 14 at two different times, from Uganda alone 40, from the Orient 150,—their hearts torn between

a glowing love of their country and a burning agony of soul for the deserted Christians whom they must leave. French missionaries were withdrawn from the Orient in even greater numbers when Turkey on its entrance into the war banished them all together, closed their institutions, and sequestrated their property. With this the catastrophe of the widespread Catholic missionary work in the Levant was practically complete. In addition there is in all French missions an ever-increasing lack of funds.

Acute crises, at least of a financial nature, occurred among the other Catholic missions. The Belgians, relatively so strongly represented, saw themselves suddenly almost wholly robbed of help from home, so much the more, when the most important associations sought refuge in voluntary exile. The Italians in India and China, even before Italy's declaration of war, complained bitterly of their material needs, and since then have been even more deserted. The Spanish have always been poor, but are keeping themselves bravely afloat.

Proportionately the English and American missions, which with diminishing exceptions are Protestant and form the principal contingent of the Protestant missionary army, have felt least the reaction of the world war. Only the British in the Orient have, like the French Catholics, been compelled to give up their fields of work, while the Americans there have been able to carry on their activities undisturbed. In East Asia, Oceanica and Africa, the English-American missionary work goes on peacefully, even if in single lands, as in Manchuria and Japan, checks have been recorded. Equally the home missionary circles in England and America carry on unweakened their missionary propaganda, as the general meeting in Garden City in January, among other things, indicated. This state of affairs may work a considerable relative readjustment in missionary affairs by

reason of the war or at least during its continuance; from a national point of view to the advantage of Anglo-Saxon missions, from a confessional to the advantage of Protestantism. While the development may turn to the profit of the one, it becomes for the other (the Germans and the Catholics), so much the more momentous.

In the meantime, while the world war has brought out many overbalancing evil consequences for the world mission, it has also shown much that is good. Especially has the common testing purified Christianity and turned it more strongly towards that which is everlasting, and thus to its missionary task. The spiritual concentration on missions and the financial support of them have indeed been pushed in the background, especially by the warring nations, but, on the other hand, there has taken possession of them, under the tremendous impact of events, a moral-religious renewal which caused the Chairman of the World Missionary Congress, John Mott, at the North American Missionary Conference, to express the confident hope "that out of the present chaos a still more beautiful structure may soon rise". Because of the world-shaking convulsion the vision of the Christian peoples will not only be extended on the missionary horizon, but there will be accumulated for world evangelization a capital which will be more valuable than gold and possessions, the will and resolution, filled with the joy of sacrifice, to carry out more loyally and more obediently the missionary command of the Redeemer of the world.

And the crisis precipitated has meant a process of purification and restoration to health for foreign missions as well as for the Christian homeland. Until the very eve of the war they suffered from many things that did not correspond with their ideals and with the will of their Founder—from too close an association with political motives and aspirations, from an all too strong reliance upon earthly aid and human means, from an exclusive dependence on the resources and finances of home sup-

port, from a failure really to take root in their provinces among the people of the land to be evangelized. In these very things the war may become a school of practical instruction for missions and their future methods. It will free and release them from so many bonds by which they have been restricted through self-seeking politics and materialistic considerations; it will remind them that missions are the messenger of God to men, the proclaimer of the Gospel and the Cross, not the agent of earthly rulers and protectors; it will turn them back upon themselves and their supernatural energy. Under the press of need, under the necessity for self-help, missions will emancipate themselves from that restless and universal dependence upon the homeland which has often been the condition and the cause of such abnormal tendencies. Of necessity, then, the work of missions must look to establishing each church organization upon a more solid basis in its own field, that it may seek its means of subsistence within itself. In other words it must look to stimulating and educating native Christians and native congregations much more intensively for their place as members of a community and for bearing the financial burden,—for the familiar threefold co-operation, self-support, self-government, self-propagation.

In fact, along the whole line we already see how the present war as the providential taskmaster begins to apply in practice these pedagogical impulses and teachings. German missionary affairs are not the only ones to suffer under its heavy blows, on account of their nationality. The ancient missionary protectorate of France, which as a State really long ago became untrue to its great traditions as the protecting power of missions, is falling into ruins; but, like the French Catholics, the Anglo-American Protestant missionaries also should learn from this collapse how fateful it may become to allow missions to be disturbed from political-material motives. Many missions which are now robbed of European aid,

because they are cut off from their benefactors at home or because of the economic necessities of these benefactors themselves, proceed to open up—as best they can—new sources for recruits and for income in the mission churches. Many a missionary and missionary bishop who hitherto has upon intelligible grounds striven against native priests or universal church taxes, now recognizes and acknowledges that he is forced by the departure of European missionaries and the draining of European contributions to turn his attention much more strongly to this problem, upon which the rescue and the future of his mission depends, to give up his scruples, to concentrate his chief care upon the native theological seminary, and from the native-born members of the church to raise the contributions for covering the cost of church maintenance. The result will be that Catholic missions also will seek to make themselves more indigenous than ever and to stand upon their own feet just as the Protestant missions, which are much freer in this respect, endeavour to do and in the future will strive much more strongly to accomplish. The native elements, for their part, show themselves in this hour of danger more willing, and more capable to fill the yawning gaps for they are making greater sacrifices for the maintenance of their churches and the training of their pastors. Among Catholics and Protestants they have acquitted themselves in this time of unprecedented trial and desertion much better than had been hoped for. Very touching is the devotion and loyalty which they have rendered to European missionaries in distress or torn from their midst, and which they still show in their letters. Thus the fire of tribulation has been a touchstone for the neophytes, in which some single surface-Christians have wavered and fallen before temptation, but which for the sincere and upright has been an opportunity to prove so much the more beautifully their real Christianity. All this must contribute, on the one hand, to bringing to pass

more quickly and more easily the social missionary aim—a completed church organization—and, on the other hand, to the spiritualization and inward sincerity of missionary management. We must not, however, conceal from ourselves the fact that in this effect of war there may lie, if it is hastened to a too early maturity, a grave danger for the quality of the missionary task and fruitage.

For the international and interconfessional relationships of missions, too, the war manifests a double aspect. On the one side, the loosening of so many international bonds not simply of exterior co-operation but also of a common inner consciousness, by reason of the unfettering of national passions among both Catholics and Protestants, is very sad. One has only to read the outbursts of hate from various French missionaries, or the controversies between German and British mission people, in order to recognize what deep, what almost impassable gulfs, this war has made between spirits which, before it, were united in similar missionary efforts, so that, from the Protestant viewpoint, one could speak of a complete ruin of the Edinburgh programme of understanding. So much the more consoling, in the midst of all this widespread bitterness, are the indications of sincere sympathy and generous-hearted readiness to aid which bring together in the exigencies of war many missionaries of the warring nations. Thus the war chronicle of the Protestant missions can tell of brotherly offers and assistance which have come to needy German missions not only from neutral Americans but even from English congregations themselves, at home and in the Indian and Chinese mission districts; and, more than this, of steps which they have taken with the authorities in England as well as in India in behalf of their persecuted brothers. And if we hear little of similar manifestations among Catholics, they are not wholly lacking, as is shown by the loving reception given to the exiled Kamerun missionaries by the Spanish mission station of Fernando Poo, and the

intercession of the Lyons missionaries for the members of the same mission who were taken away as prisoners.

The war also has not left undisturbed that even more delicate mutual relationship of different communions in the mission field, especially among Catholics and Protestants. No particulars of the situation among the individual Protestant denominations have become known, but there little inducement to friction and difficulties would be offered. From all sides, however, and especially from India, complaints come to us that Protestants have usurped the places of Catholics who have been called away to join the armies, and that Catholics have usurped the places of Protestant missionaries who have been taken prisoners, that each confession seeks to dislodge the other and to turn the situation to its own advantage, which of course is in absolute opposition to missionary comity. Here and there, however, interconfessional help and especially a common need has brought Catholic and Protestant mission congregations nearer together, not merely in material defence and assistance, but in a community of spiritual devotions and interests against the common foe. Thus that which has served to separate missionaries who were comrades in belief and confession—national solidarity and love of country—has also united and reconciled children of the same country who were separated in their belief. Surmounting all barriers of dogma and church polity, men have learned to love and cherish one another, yes, even to recognize that in spite of all that separates us there is also much that binds us together. May this lesson of the war be taken to heart, and may it inaugurate a new era when in Christian thought and feeling men may the better bear with and understand one another!

Evangelicalism in the Church of England:

Its Present Position and Future Prospects

By E. C. Dewick, M.A.,
Vice Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

In the Church, as in politics, a so-called "party" or "school of thought" might often be more accurately described as a "coalition." Men whose methods and ideals are widely divergent nevertheless unite under a common party-title, because they believe that combination, and combination alone, will enable them to carry into effect their several desires. In the Church of England, this is probably true today of each of the leading schools of thought; and not least, of that which is commonly known as "Evangelical."

It is evident that there is within the English Church at the present time, not only a large number of Churchmen who style themselves Evangelicals, but also an "Evangelical Party" with a certain measure of corporate self-consciousness. The existence of this Party is clearly manifested on certain occasions—notably at the annual Clerical Meeting at Islington, which is avowedly and exclusively a gathering of Evangelical Churchmen, and is probably the largest annual clerical gathering to be found anywhere in this country.[1] No one can have witnessed the large and increasing attendance (especially of the younger clergy) at "Islington" in recent years, without realizing that the Evangelical Party is a factor

[1]In 1914, it numbered about 1200 clergy (*The Times*, 14th January, 1914).

of great—and probably growing—importance in the life of the English Church.

At the same time, it is clear that within this Party there are many varieties of belief and practice. The distinction between the Older and the Younger Evangelicals has of late been the subject of frequent comment. A similar distinction might be found in any school of thought which comprises men of different ages, and so it is not a peculiar feature of Evangelicalism alone. But besides this, there are various types of men to be found within both the older and the younger sections of the Party, exhibiting a wide diversity of temperament and outlook. They would all claim (with greater or less insistence) to be "Evangelical Churchmen"; and they all hold (no doubt) the same general position in matters of doctrine. But the *proportions* of their teaching will be found to vary considerably, for they do not all lay the same emphasis on the several elements of the Evangelical message. Here it is one feature, and there another, which acts as the magnet to win adherence and to arouse enthusiasm; here it is one point, and there another, which becomes the "centre of gravity" in the preaching, while all else is allowed to remain in comparative obscurity. So the motives which induce men to associate themselves with the Evangelical Party are many and various, and consequently the tendencies and aims of the several types of Evangelicals do not always exactly coincide.

At the present time, there are at least four distinct types of Evangelical Churchmen: the Traditional, the Protestant, the Evangelistic, and the Liberal. If we compare these four types with the division between the Older and the Younger Evangelicals, the relation between them is seen to be roughly as follows:—the Older group comprises the great bulk of the Traditional and the Protestant Evangelicals, and a large proportion of those whose primary motive is Evangelistic; while

the Younger Evangelicals include practically the whole of the Liberal element, together with a good number of the Evangelistic and Protestant types, and a few who, though their sympathies are Traditional, yet feel unable to adhere altogether to the old paths. Needless to add, there are many individual Evangelicals who partake of the characteristics of more than one of these types, and others who do not readily lend themselves to classification.

The Traditional Evangelicals have naturally the first claim on our consideration, for they by their up-bringing have inherited the old traditions of the Party, and have known no other. The foremost characteristic of the Traditional Evangelical is his staunch conservatism, both in politics and in theology. His theology is fixed and clear-cut, based directly upon the phraseology of the English Bible. It may be somewhat narrow in its scope, and mainly individualistic in its application; but it is powerful and definite, and (at its best) is enforced by a confident appeal to personal religious experience. Sometimes, however, the distinction between the "letter" and the "spirit" seems scarcely to be sufficiently borne in mind, so that there is an over-readiness to resist every proposal to modify the language of ancient formularies, and to denounce all criticism which questions the historical inerrancy of Scripture, as though it were an attempt to deny altogether the work of the Holy Spirit in the sacred writings.

This same instinctive conservatism generally makes the Traditional Evangelical a strong politician; and indeed it is his political bias, far more than his theology, which determines his attitude to many of the problems of the day. It is on political grounds, for instance, that he views social reform with suspicion, and is quick to affirm that the minister of the Gospel ought not to concern himself with questions which are not "spiritual". The Traditional Evangelical is, of course, a Protestant,

and when he is alarmed by the cry of "No Popery" (especially in connection with Home Rule) or scandalized by ritualistic innovations, his Protestantism becomes exceedingly militant. But, for political and social reasons, he has an instinctive dislike of "Dissenters", and consequently little sympathy with projects for reunion—not because of any theological scruples concerning the validity of non-episcopal Orders, but simply because the Free Churchman is generally "one of those horrid Radicals", besides being, as a rule, "not quite a gentleman". Moreover, at times when the Education Controversy or Disestablishment is to the fore, the Traditional Evangelical will vigorously proclaim himself a "good Churchman", and will stand shoulder to shoulder with his High Anglican brother to denounce the sacrilegious proposals. Indeed, there is much common ground between the Traditional Evangelical and the old-fashioned High Churchman. Both of them are (at their best) fine types of the old English gentleman; and an alliance between the two is often natural and mutually profitable.

The Traditional Evangelicals still form an important element in the Evangelical Party; but their influence is certainly on the wane, chiefly because they have not been able to retain the support of any appreciable number of the younger generation. Here and there, indeed, a young man may be found who walks closely in the old paths; but for the most part, the young men who come from Traditional Evangelical homes are either drawn to some other type of Evangelicalism, or else they become avowed converts to Anglo-Catholicism. Sometimes they become "Moderate Evangelicals", with so much emphasis on the *moderation* that no other features can be clearly discerned. If questioned as to their Churchmanship, they will hesitatingly plead guilty to Evangelicalism of a sort, but will be careful at once to apologize for it: "Oh yes, I suppose we are Evangelical—

but not at all extreme, you know; *quite* a bright service—*Hymns Ancient and Modern* . . ." etc., etc. Such persons are scarcely likely to exercise a strong formative influence on the future of Evangelical Churchmanship.

The Protestant Evangelical is probably identified in many minds with his brother of the Traditional school; and from some points of view the resemblance is undoubtedly close. But while the Protestantism of the Traditional Evangelical is essentially defensive, and is simply the expression of a conservative antagonism to novelties in doctrine and ritual, the Protestantism of the really Protestant Evangelical compels him to an aggressive campaign; for anti-Romanism and anti-Ritualism hold the foremost place in his religion. Often he is democratic in his sympathies, and far from cultured in his methods. He will join in the denunciation of Higher Criticism, because he thinks it weakens the force of his appeal to "the Bible only", which is one of his most effective weapons of controversy. He finds a congenial ally in a certain type of Nonconformist, and occasionally in the Broad Churchman. Often he is well-read in theology, for he realizes that it is impossible to be permanently successful in controversy without a competent knowledge of the facts and theories under dispute.

Generally speaking, Protestant Evangelicalism flourishes in a controversial atmosphere, where Romanism or Ritualism is making advances; but in times of peace and good-will it loses its distinctive features; its older adherents become "Traditional", its younger, "Liberal". Owing to its aggressive vigour, it attracts an attention greater than its real influence merits; and it has won for the Evangelical Party as a whole a reputation for factiousness and love of negation which is not generally deserved.

Another group, also distinguished by a predominant emphasis on one point, consists of those whom we have called the Evangelistic Evangelicals. To these, the one thing needful is the salvation of the individual soul.

Their policy is thus positive, and (in a sense) progressive; in pursuit of it they are prepared to adopt unconventional methods (such as open-air preaching, lantern services in church, parochial missions), which scandalize the more staid among their brother clergy. Even in the private intercourse of every-day life they are ever ready to speak a word in season on spiritual topics. In many ways, such men form the very best element in Evangelicalism; for they have put "first things first"; they have done more than any others to save the Christianity of today from becoming a mere conventional formalism; and they have proclaimed in the forefront of their message the oft-forgotten truth that the Gospel is a spiritual *power* in the life of the individual. But their weakness has been a tendency to look askance at culture and to disparage learning, as "things which do not help to save souls". Consequently the "gospel" which they have preached has often been too narrow to meet the diverse needs of men; and their "plan of salvation", so clear to themselves in the light of their own conversion, has failed to explain the religious experiences of many whose spirituality is beyond all question. Hence their influence is not so widespread as could be wished. But to minds of a certain type they are God's best messengers of salvation; and to the whole Church their spiritual power and prayerfulness is an asset of incalculable value.

So far, we have considered the present position of the Evangelical school as it is represented by those of its adherents whose predominant characteristic is either a conservative adherence to tradition, or a Protestant horror of Romanism, or an evangelistic zeal for soul-winning.

There remains another, and not the least important section of the party—the Liberal Evangelicals. Of these, a large number have been brought up in the Evangelical school, and are genuinely attached to its

principles, both by conviction and also for old association's sake; only they are convinced that the ancient phraseology and forms of worship require some modification, in order to meet the needs of the present day. Another element among the Liberal Evangelicals consists of those who are 'verts from other schools of thought, with which they have become for various reasons dissatisfied. These have attached themselves to Liberal Evangelicalism, because they hope it may prove to be a nucleus out of which a Churchmanship more nearly after their own hearts' desire will in time be evolved. Men of this type naturally do not feel closely bound to the tenets of the older Evangelicalism; so they form the "left wing" of the party, taking the lead in the demand for drastic changes.

As to the particular character of the changes needed, Liberal Evangelicals are not all agreed; but there is one real bond of union between them; namely, the strong conviction that, while some sort of change is essential to present-day Evangelicalism, yet it *is* Evangelicalism, rather than any other type of Churchmanship, which will best lend itself to the kind of developments needed.

Compared with other types of Evangelicals, the "Liberals" are distinguished chiefly by this desire for change, and by a readiness to welcome new ideas. In the past, this has been apparent chiefly in their friendly attitude towards Biblical criticism, because this has of late been the chief battleground of the old and new learning. If (as seems not unlikely) this battleground should shift in the near future to other fields of thought, we may expect to find the distinctive tendencies of Liberal Evangelicalism shifting in a corresponding manner. For wheresoever New Thought is, there will the Liberals (be they Catholic or Protestant) be gathered together.

The spirit of Liberal Evangelicalism is in some ways akin to that of Liberal Anglo-Catholicism. Both schools

of thought are composed largely of young men; both are more or less in sympathy with the principles of the Higher Criticism; both are modern in their outlook, seeing visions and dreaming dreams for the future; both lay stress upon the necessity for the Atonement, and for the "conversion" of the individual. Consequently some have concluded that these two types of the younger Churchmanship of today are essentially at one, and that the Liberal Evangelicals are in reality half-developed Anglo-Catholics, needing only a little patient guidance to show them that the logical issue of their present tendency must be "the Catholic Faith in its fulness".

But this estimate is a superficial one. There is at the present time a marked line of cleavage between the Liberal Evangelicals and their Anglo-Catholic brethren with regard to the doctrines of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments. These are grave matters on which to differ; for they concern the way in which God normally deals with man, and conveys to him His grace. Nor are there many signs that, in respect to these doctrines, the younger Evangelicals are disposed to modify their distinctive tenets, or to depart substantially from the old Evangelical teaching.

The line of cleavage above-mentioned appears to be due largely to two different methods of approaching the subject. To the Anglo-Catholic, the authority of ecclesiastical tradition is exceedingly cogent, and the objective reality of God's promised grace is the supreme truth of the Christian revelation. Hence he emphasizes the *certainty* of the grace conveyed, and the *necessity* of the "channels of grace" hallowed by Catholic usage. The Liberal Evangelical, on the other hand, lays greater stress upon the appeal to the religious experience of Christian people at large (including the laity and even the "unorthodox"), and affirms that the reception of sacramental grace is normally conditioned by the moral and spiritual attitude of the recipient. Hence, it is broadly true to

say that while the older Evangelical denounced the High Churchman for teaching *too much*, the younger Evangelical of today is impressed rather by the inadequacy and *negativeness* of current Anglo-Catholic doctrine. The *denial* of the validity of non-episcopal Orders, the *denial* of the titles of "Churchman" and "Catholic" to a great part of Christendom, the *denial* of the rightfulness of such customs as non-fasting Communion or Evening Communion—all these denials are stumbling-blocks to the Liberal Evangelical, because they do not appear to him to correspond with the facts of God's working in the world as manifested in the wide field of Christian experience; nor does he find any warrant for them in the teaching of our Lord, as recorded in the New Testament.

Moreover, the emphasis laid by Anglo-Catholics upon the real objectivity of God's presence and grace in the sacraments appears to the younger Evangelical to be, not so much erroneous, but one-sided; because it scarcely leaves adequate scope for the moral responsibility of the individual, and tends to lower the conception of the Christian sacraments to the level of magical ceremonies. Further, the sharp distinction between a "sacramental" and "non-sacramental" presence and grace seems to be artificial, and to sever "the Sacraments of the Church" from the Sacramental Principle which pervades the whole of God's Creation. For, indeed, many of the Liberal Evangelicals believe firmly in "Sacramentalism"; but theirs is a Sacramentalism which covers the whole of human life, inasmuch as they recognize all life to be ("by divers portions and in divers manners") an outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of God.

There is every sign that, while on many points there are differences of opinion amongst Liberal Evangelical Churchmen, they are united at the present time in favour of a less exclusive and more conditional doctrine of

sacramental grace than that which is taught in Anglo-Catholic circles. On a grave issue, such as that which recently arose in East Africa, Liberal Evangelicals—no less than the older Evangelicals—showed themselves unanimous in their support of the principles adopted by the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa. It may be that their own conception of the Church and Sacraments is at times a little nebulous; but at least they are agreed in their refusal to erect barriers and boundaries to God's grace until they are convinced that such barriers have the authority of Scripture and of experience.

It will be evident from what has been said above that in many respects Liberal Evangelicalism is akin to Broad Churchmanship. But the Evangelical (whether Liberal or not) lays much greater stress upon the personal aspect of religion, and especially upon personal salvation from the guilt and power of sin, as the essence of the Christian life. To him, Broad Churchmanship appears to be a cultured and academic theory, suitable for the study or the lecture-room, but not clear enough nor strong enough to satisfy the needs of human life on its darker side—for instance, in the slum-parish, or at the bedside of a dying sinner. While Broad Churchmanship is pre-eminently an *intellectual* movement, Liberal Evangelicalism derives its inspiration mainly from the *spiritual* experience of Christian people. Enough perhaps has been said to indicate the distinctive characteristics of Liberal Evangelicalism compared with other types of younger Churchmanship. To forecast its future policy is not easy. It is almost impossible as yet to estimate the change which the War may make in the relations between various types of thought within the Church. At the present time there are many voices offering counsel. Some contend that the chief weakness of Evangelical Churchmen in the past has been their tendency to Undenominationalism. The great need of the future (they tell us) is more "definite

Church teaching". Let Evangelicals co-operate with other Churchmen, and "level up" their services to the normal standard of Moderate Churchmanship; let them show that *they* are in truth the real "Central Churchmen"; and they will soon renew their strength, while the whole Church will be the better for a united body of sober and moderate opinion, able to check excesses on either side. Evangelicals who advocate this policy deprecate any emphasis on distinctively Protestant features in doctrine or ritual, and are inclined to tolerate, or even vaguely to accept, "High" doctrines of the Church and Sacraments. Nevertheless it is generally noticeable that when once an Evangelical has gained a clear and intelligent grasp of the "Sacramental idea" as taught by Anglo-Catholics, he either rejects it definitely and becomes a decided Protestant once more; or else he openly transfers his allegiance to the other school of thought, and calls himself an "Evangelical Catholic" rather than a "Catholic Evangelical".

Another section of Liberal Evangelicals advocate a diametrically opposite policy. They point out that in doctrine they are substantially at one with the majority of "Free Churchmen"—particularly Presbyterians and Wesleyans; and it is with these, rather than with Anglicans of other types, that they desire closer co-operation and unity. Many Evangelicals of this type are frankly impatient of the restraints which hinder them from inter-communion with Nonconformists; and "The Reunion of Protestant Christendom" is their watchword. They are decisive and uncompromising in their rejection of Sacramentalism (in the narrower sense of the word), and the necessity for the Apostolic Succession, as taught by Anglo-Catholics. But unlike the typical "Protestant Evangelical", they are in sympathy with modern thought, accepting the principles of the Higher Criticism, and somewhat loosely attached to Creeds and formularies. A few of them have come to the conclusion that the

only lasting solution to the present controversies in our Church would be a severance between the "Catholic" and "Protestant" sections, so that the latter might be free to federate with their natural allies in the non-episcopal Churches. The majority, however, would deeply regret a schism within the Church of England, partly because of the bitterness and strife which would thereby be engendered, and partly because they think they can see signs of a coming re-action against the exclusiveness of Anglo-Catholicism. In that case they feel that the movement would need wise and sympathetic guidance from those within the Anglican Communion; and they hope that herein might be a great opportunity for Liberal Evangelical Churchmen to influence the whole future of English Christianity.

There are other types of Liberal Evangelicals besides those which we have described; the Ritualistic Evangelicals, whose chief desire is a greater scope for art and music; the Philosophic Evangelicals, who believe that the greatest need of today is a well-thought-out intellectual basis for Evangelicalism; the Social Reformers, who long to see Evangelical Churchmen recognized as the leaders and champions of "the people" against class privileges and vested interests. And then there are the "Student Movement Evangelicals"—those who have caught the peculiar inspiration of Baslow or Swanwick, or the Edinburgh Conference; men—and women—with a wide outlook, and many-sided sympathy, and a strong faith in the future; Christians before they are Churchmen, but owning a greater loyalty to their Church as a whole than to any party within it. At the present time, they are painfully conscious of the Church's failure to give a clear Christian witness to the world, and they realize intensely the need for a Catholic Church (howsoever defined and organized) in the days to come. Their message to modern Evangelicalism is the need for mutual charity and patient

study of each others' point of view, as the only preparation for a great forward movement by the Church in the days to come.

With so many tendencies at work within the Evangelical Party in the Church of England it is hard indeed to foresee its future prospects. But it seems clear that if any notable developments take place, their beginnings are to be looked for among the Liberal element in the party. Other types of Evangelicalism will doubtless continue to be with us. Natural conservatism, always a deep-rooted instinct of human-kind, will continue to produce the Traditional Evangelicals; Rome, as long as she remains Romish, will continue to provoke men in to Protestant Evangelicalism. But these types, while performing valuable services to the Church by way of warning and criticism, are so essentially conservative or negative that they are not likely to inaugurate a forward policy. Their whole efforts are directed to resist impending changes, and even in this they are not likely (if one may judge from the past) to be entirely successful. Nor is there any sign that Evangelistic Evangelicalism will become the centre of any striking developments. Its influence, pure and strong though it is, is scarcely of a kind to direct the currents of modern thought, or mould the course of ecclesiastical politics.

It is otherwise with Liberal Evangelicalism. At the present time, it is the home of many adventurous minds, and much depends on the counsels which ultimately prevail among its adherents.

With regard to the future, there are several possibilities. Is Evangelicalism doomed to be gradually extinguished before the onward march of Catholicism? Or is it destined to become the norm of Churchmanship, a central rallying-ground for all that is best in the Christian religion? Or must we recognize that, while Evangelicalism has indeed a great future before it,

yet its future must be sought outside the Anglican Communion? In other words, is it essential for the true development of Evangelicalism that there should be a close federal unity and mutual inter-communion amongst *all* (episcopalians or non-episcopalians) whose Christianity is based on Evangelical principles, even if such a union should involve the risk of a severance between Evangelical Churchmen and other Churchmen whose tenets forbid them to countenance any such policy? In view of the past history of Christendom, and of the recent history of Anglicanism, it is conceivable that this might come to be the only course consistent with loyalty to deep-rooted convictions. But we in England, at a time when national unity is seen to be so vital to our country's welfare, dare not even think of disunion with our National Church. Nor can anyone who has learnt to love the ancient Church of England as his spiritual mother contemplate the possibility of schism in her midst without profound grief and dismay. Instinctively we pray, God forbid!

And so our eyes turn rather to a brighter vision—the vision of a day when Evangelicalism shall have found the true fulfilment of its vocation in the Church that is to be; a Church in which the ideals of Catholic and Protestant, Churchman and Nonconformist, shall have blended in a wider truth, and each shall recognize that the other has been needed and used by God, as a steward holding in trust a contribution towards the building-up of the Body of Christ.

A Unifying Theology

By John Wright Buckham, D.D.,
Pacific Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal.

Subtly and strongly, consciously and unconsciously, the modern Church is being carried toward unity. Varied currents without and within are impelling her. Among those from the outside are present-day philosophy with its anti-dogmatic, anti-intellectualistic spirit and its emphasis upon values; the new psychology with its keen analysis of religious motives and its effort to reduce all the varied forms of religion to common instincts and impulses, and the study of the history of religion, with its revelations of the consanguinity of all religions and hence of all forms of Christianity. Natural Science, too, has for years been quietly instilling the principle of unity by broadening the horizon, inculcating patience and co-operation and magnifying the law of development. Political and social movements and theories likewise are pressing home upon the Church the need and the desirability of co-operation. Strategically, economically, socially, it is becoming clear that it is for the advantage, if not necessary to the actual survival, of the churches to come together. Otherwise they cannot cope with the social forces working against them or realize their own inherent strength.

Within the Church the sense of insufficiency and of alienation from the mind and heart of the people has been deepening. Shame and sorrow for the misunderstandings, the divisions, the wastes, which are crippling and sapping her strength, are growing daily more poignant. Criticism of the Church is no longer met by her with haughty uncon-

cern or vociferous denial. Such a searching and severe verdict as that of Professor Eucken, in his recent volume *Can We Still be Christians?* to the effect that the churches no longer truly represent Christianity, cannot but arouse a sense of the need of union,—not for the defense of outgrown statements of doctrine but for the advance of genuine Christianity.

Under the spur of these incentives and warnings, far-seeing minds in all branches of the Church are looking for a unifying principle, a bond of sympathy, which will draw all Christians nearer together and enable the Church to rebuild her walls in the fair colours of harmony and peace.

I

When we get below our surface differences and penetrate to the foundation upon which all portions of the Christian Church rest, what do we find? Is there a rock upon which all, so far as they are true to their purpose, are builded? At first, when one surveys the perplexing differences of cult and creed, it seems as if no common ground could be found between forms of faith so alien as those of the Orthodox, Roman, Anglican, and Protestant communions. Yet the very word *communion*, the very nature of Christianity, involves unity.

If there is an underlying bond in Christianity, what is it? Manifestly, it is not a creed. All attempts to unite upon the basis of a common symbol have failed and are bound to do so. No historic statement of faith, even the Apostles' Creed, simple and concise as it is, will command the assent of all Christians. The trouble is, not so much with the formulas, as with the principle of creedal unity itself. It makes that primary which is not in its nature such. It subordinates the Spirit to the letter. In the words of Professor Van Der Vlugt, of Leyden University,

"The more, therefore, you favour the awakening of that Spirit by abstaining from a hopeless search for the formulas of universal concord and allowing its full scope to every particular shade of religious

needs and hopes, the firmer may be your reliance upon the gradual quenching of these fratricidal quarrels".[1]

We have compassed this mountain of creed-concord long enough. It is time to turn elsewhere for our Land of Promise.

Even clearer than the defects of creed as a uniting principle are those of cult and polity. No outward form of worship, or of government, can possibly serve as our band of union. For these, too, are secondary and admit of unlimited diversity and adaptation.

II

What, then, is our united possession, our talisman of union? Is there any definite reality, common to the Christian of the first century and the twentieth, to the orthodox and the liberal, the liturgist and the non-liturgist, the Salvation Army soldier and the theologian, which is not only negatively acceptable but positively unifying? In the light of a reawakened Christian consciousness, may we not answer: *Yes, we have a common Christian experience.* Not that this experience is uniform. It has not only the variations of different stages, groups and schools of Christians, but it differs in every individual. Nevertheless, underneath these variations there is a common substratum which, however indefinable, is intensely real, vital, unifying. It speaks more or less clearly through creeds, cults, activities, but it is more than they and deeper. It is not mere feeling, neither is it mere knowledge. No one can state in exact terms just what Christian experience is, yet each knows when he has it and when others have it. He knows that a new sense of values, a new outlook upon life, a new motive, has taken possession of him and that all this is distinctly Christian in its nature.

This experience centres in Jesus Christ as the One who makes God real to us. Just how or why He does this,

[1] *The Church, the People and the Age*, p. 106.

we may not be able to agree. Certainly the interpretations of the personality of Christ differ widely. Yet all Christians find in Him incomparable—may we not say redemptive—values. In a profoundly real sense it is true to say that the Church has "One Lord". In spite of our "unhappy divisions" and contentions, Paul's question is still pertinent: "Is Christ divided?" Division there is *about* Christ,—much of it bitter and Christless—but division *of* Him there is not and cannot be. And all who really love and follow Him are by that very fact united through Him to each other. It is primarily a personal relationship, not creedal, nor institutional. As such it transcends all boundaries of sect and denomination. So far as this experience is real, there is neither Orthodox nor Romanist, Catholic nor Protestant, but Christ is all and in all. There is, therefore, a *de facto* Christian unity, which, as Dr. Newman Smyth has so opportunely insisted, should be more fully recognized.[2] Unto a church that hath shall be given and it shall have abundantly.

This Christian experience, this personal relationship of the believer to Jesus Christ—and thus to God and to life itself through Him—is practically what is known as "faith". If Christians could only come to an agreement as to the nature of faith—do away with the misunderstanding and confusion which have come from identifying faith either with intellectual assent or with mere emotion—a great part of the cause of past misunderstanding and strife and of present obstacles to unity would be removed. Much mischief has come from the effort to cut off faith, not only from works but from knowledge and from love. Because the Protestant has insisted so earnestly upon salvation by faith alone, has the Romanist ground to infer that he has no regard whatever for works? Or has the Eastern Christian reason to think that the Protestant excludes from faith either knowledge or love?

[2] See *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism.*

The discussion of this subject in the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY for March, 1914, brought out not only the old divergencies but evidences of a concordant view. Professor Maher, setting forth a "Catholic Account of Faith", represents it as "an intellectual assent to testimony, an acceptance or embracing by the understanding of revealed truth"; while Canon Green, speaking as an Anglican, defines faith as "the response of man's whole nature to God". It is encouraging to find the latter view in so close harmony with that of Archbishop Platon who, speaking from the standpoint of the Orthodox Church, says:

> "Faith presents the aspect of man's personal relation to Christ the Saviour. It is not merely an agreement of our intellects to the truths of salvation contained in divine revelation, but an assimilation of these truths by our hearts, and, so to speak, their transmutation into our very life and activity".

Here is an approximation, at least, to a common understanding between representatives of the older sect of the Church and the younger. Evidence might also be brought forward to show that many of the most honoured Roman Catholics have shared this view of faith too. Indeed this conception of faith as intuitive, experiential, voluntary, vital, is that both of the New Testament and of the great body of Christian discipleship throughout history.

III

Yet, although the basis and bond of Christian Unity can, in the nature of the case be none other than Christian experience, or "faith"—an inner indefinable, personal apprehension of truth—must we exclude from our common inheritance and possession all statements, interpretations and harmonizations of experience,—all that may properly be called theology? Has the Christian Church as a whole no great essential doctrines that command the assent of all Christians, held *semper ubique et ab omnibus?* It would surely be strange if there were no doctrines what-

ever upon which we can agree. Granted all possible range and liberty of thought, can we unite in nothing doctrinal? Are there no Christian truths which hold us all in the grip of a great conviction? The history of Christianity—in spite of controversies, schisms and heresies—speaks otherwise. The two greatest symbols—the Roman and the Nicene—although they do not and cannot serve as the basis of church unity, possess, nevertheless, a sacredness and a sense of assurance which endear them to the Church at large. Historically interpreted, they are of priceless worth and will become more and more prized the further the Church moves away from them in the process of time and growth. So too, with other great historic confessions which are the fruitage of the faith, if not of the Church universal, yet of large and important sections of it.

Certain great doctrinal treatises, too, have a permanent value as inspired expressions of the faith of the ages. And yet, upon none of these as a fixed form of faith, as we have found, can the churches unite. For none of these confessions or treatises is more than tentative. Statements and expressions of faith are one thing; the convictions lying back of them are another. The former *must* change if the latter are to continue vital. Conformity, either with fixed formulas or with well-wrought systems, is deadening. The letter killeth. "It is . . . the fundamental error of all orthodoxy to look upon accord with doctrine as the first and most pressing demand", as Professor Friedrich Loofs has said.[3]

All this is familiar in present-day religious thought, but it needs constant and emphatic reiteration. Only when it is thoroughly grasped are we ready to go on to realize that the Church has not only a common faith, but certain *great fundamental convictions growing out of that faith* which it is our perpetual duty to endeavour to define and defend. In this task mutual aid is needed from all

[3] *The Church, the People and the Age*, p. 292.

branches of the Church. If one imagines that there can be no sympathy whatever between loyal thinkers of different Christian sects let him turn to the article by Baron Von Hügel upon the theology of Professor Troeltsch in the number of the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY already referred to and read such a sentence as this:

> "Yet just those convictions and habits which, within my own life, I feel to be most centrally Catholic appear to me, ever increasingly, to require the aid precisely of what is most growing, and most rich, in Troeltsch's positive convictions; and, in return, these convictions seem to me to require for their full protection, expansion, and fruitfulness, much of the soil and environment they possess within my own Catholic spiritual life."

In such evidences of breadth and catholicity of mind as this lies the promise of a better day.

IV

When one goes to the heart of Christian theology and searches for its *principia* there are four truths which in various forms may be said to constitute the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, binding together in practical unanimity eras, centuries, schools, sects, denominations, yet ever demanding fresh insight and interpretation. They are (1) the Fatherhood of God; (2) the revealing and redemptive personality of Jesus Christ; (3) individual renewal through the Spirit as a personal ideal and the Kingdom of God as a social ideal; (4) the immortality of the spirit life, both in the race and in the individual.

Each of these truths admits of and has received great diversity of conception and presentation. Each is simple in essence yet so profound and expansive in content and application as to call out the richest efforts at comprehension and realization that the growing mind of the Church can put forth.

The Divine Fatherhood, for instance, comprehensible and precious to childhood minds and ages, involves all the problems of transcendence and immanence, of creation

and providence, upon which Christian theology and philosophy have been engaged for twenty centuries. It includes the presence and activity of Spirit in the cosmos as well as in human hearts.

So, too, with the Christ, over whose nature such bitter controversy has raged. Upon the redemptive Personality of Christ we can all unite. It is coming home to the mind of the Church at last that, whatever theory we may hold of the nature of Christ,—Virgin Birth, Logos, Deity, Kenotic, Humanitarian—the Personality accounted for in such contrasted ways is the dominant reality that incites and compels all our Christologies. Upon the need of self-realization (regeneration, salvation) too we are all at one. As to the Social Ideal that burns at the heart of Christianity,—is it not essentially the same in all the ages? Cataclysmic or developmental, conquering or permeating, is not the reign of righteousness the one imperative aim of all the followers of the suffering but victorious Christ? Finally is not the perdurance of the spirit life,—whatever the differences as to the conditions of the future life—the cherished conviction of the Church universal?

Here is a doctrinal quadrilateral which, however varied in interpretation, is inclusive of and conclusive for all Christians. Has there ever been, can there ever be, a group of Christians from whose cherished convictions any one of these cardinal truths is wanting? Not that this is the sum of our common holdings; but it represents its substance. In this great concern of maintaining a uniting theology, the one thing needful is the power to grasp essentials. Does this *credo* seem in any sense meagre, obvious, insufficient? Consider the scope and positiveness of the *Leben-anschauung* for which it stands. Consider the denial and doubt with which, outside of Christian faith, every one of these affirmations is today, and always has been, confronted. Currents of thought, tides of dismay, rush in to sweep these verities away. In

every age, and not least in our own, objections, difficulties, obstacles, arise like threatening spectres to shake our hold upon these verities. Clear and assuring as they are, it has never been and never will be easy to hold fast to them. To be true to them calls for all the power of a united and invincible faith. The *will to believe* must reinforce rational conviction. For this great enterprise of truth-affirmation, this solemn league and covenant of loyalty to our highest convictions, we need each other. In unity is strength.

V

Upon the basis of a common experience, in loyalty to one Lord, and with so positive a uniting theology, how far may we hope to see the scattered forces of the Christian army move toward unity? And what should be the steps in this direction?

With these questions it is not the province of this paper to deal. It would be foolish to ignore the deep-seated separative and segregative factors which confront us. Differences,—temperamental, intellectual, cultural, governmental,—cannot be reduced to uniformity. Polity cannot well be made absolutely uniform and fixed. Methods of work should continue flexible and variant. The Church must remain multiform, or be untrue to the normal diversifications of life.

Aside from normal differences, grave and apparently irreconcilable disagreements block the pathway. Sacerdotalism, as Canon Henson has pointed out, is a barrier that seems to shut one great division of Christians away from another.[4] The claim of absolute authority for the Papacy is a seemingly inseparable barrier to unity. Institutionalism itself appears to many essentially non-Christian.

Yet even with these deep discrepancies between Roman Catholic and Protestant continuing, there is possible a

[4] See *The Road to Unity*, pp. 44–47.

degree of fraternal feeling and active co-operation far beyond anything in the past or the present. If not as organizations, at least as Christians we may fellowship each other. If the sectarian insists that no concord is possible so long as one of the parties clings to falsities and superstitions, the reply is that fellowshipping a church does not involve the recognition of all its claims and practises any more than friendship with a person involves condoning his faults. And have Roman Catholics no faults to find in Protestants,—no inconsistencies, disparities, barbarities, quite out of keeping with our professions?

As for friendly intercourse with the Eastern Church, that seems even more difficult. "How can enlightenment and obscurantism, living progress and lifeless conservatism, fraternize?" it will be asked. Even if this bold contrast were just, should not charity bear all things, believe all things, hope all things? Is it certain that Eastern Christendom is for ever fettered? Are we sure that there is no sap in this aged trunk?

It is within the Protestant ranks, however, that advance toward unity is most pressing and most possible, as it is here that disunion and misunderstanding are most heinous and most harmful. Here the emphasis upon Christian experience is strongest; here freedom of judgment begets that richness and amplitude of view that leads to genuine and hearty mutual respect; here divergence upon non-essentials lends the greater strength and significance to accord upon essentials.

Whatever may come of the movement toward a world conference of all the communions of the Church, be it much or little, there is every reason why a more vigorous approach toward unity within Protestantism should be sought—eliminating the enormous waste now so intolerable, drawing together the isolated and enfeebled detachments of what should be a single great army.

How this is to be brought about is a matter for careful constructive statesmanship. "The Federal Council of

the Churches of Christ in America" seems to open the natural avenue for advance in this country. The gradual and normal development of this Federation into such an organized unity of spirit and activity as will secure effectiveness, maintaining the integrity of the greater denominational bodies yet securing their even closer harmony in progressive unity, would appear to be the open pathway for us in America.

There is no reason why denominational loyalty of the right kind should not coexist with and even further this comprehensive unity, just as the automony and progress of the individual state of the United States strengthens the nation as a whole, just as true patriotism furthers internationalism. "If they were all one member, where were the body?" But the purpose of this paper is not to discuss ways and means so much as to point out that both the larger unity of the Church as a whole, and that of Protestantism, rest ultimately upon unity of faith, and not upon mere outward conformity, or similarity of aim, or need of self-protection.

Underlying all our disunions there is not only a common Christian experience which is basal and binding, but also a body of common conviction, a vital doctrinal consensus far richer than has ever been recognized. The Church at large has been blind to its own unity. We have not seen the forest because of the trees—and the groves.

The Church has failed to realize that underneath all its doctrinal outgrowths, feeding the roots even of its tangles and underbrush, is the inexhaustible soil of a common vital spiritual experience out of which have grown certain great essential convictions which, the more firmly and vitally they are realized, the more surely will they draw us toward one another.

Fellowships of Hope

By Nathaniel Micklem, M.A.

The origins of great movements, as of great rivers, have often been very small. It was said that the Kingdom of Heaven should grow as from a grain of mustard seed. Let this be my excuse for trying to set forth at some length what, as it seems to certain British Free Churchmen, is the call of God to them and what is their attempted response to it. I crave forbearance in the difficult task of describing a point of view, a spirit at once of adventure and of receptivity shared in greater or less degree by many, or rather a movement of God's living Spirit upon the hearts of such as are able in some degree to respond to it, a movement which, if these be faithful, is pregnant with blessing to the whole Universal Church.

I shall try to describe for you my friend Francis because he seems to me a typical representative of these men and women; for to the women quite as much as to the men is this hope and vision come.

I

A few years ago he was what we should call "a rank individualist," holding a very low view of the Church and even inclined to regard the Church's day as over. In this matter his mind has undergone a complete change, due, I think, chiefly to contact through the Student Christian Movement with Anglican Churchmen of the "Catholic" tendency. Now, however, he cordially agrees with what one of his brotherhood has written, "In developing our idea of the Christian Church, it must be made

clear that the Church is central to Christianity. An attempt must be made to recover the New Testament ideal; in the world which we tread as we read that book there gathers about the Church at once an atmosphere of wonder and of homeliness. The Church is the holy Bride of Christ; it is His Body; it is also the family of the firstborn from the dead. . . . A merely individualistic Christianity is a self-contradiction. We must regain from the Apostolic age some of its passionate love for the Church and its jealousy for the honour of the Bride of Christ. The Church must be no optional addendum. It is the divinely appointed home of the Christian soul and the centre of Christian fellowship. No man can afford to despise what it offers, and no man can stand outside it without suffering loss."

This quickening of Churchmanship shows itself in several ways.

(i) Once more the Church enters movingly into his creed: "I believe in the Holy Church, the Communion of Saints." Francis is in no danger here of identifying the visible organized Churches with that Holy Church which is an object of faith, not of sight. It is because she is a spiritual reality, the Body of Christ, those who by faith dwell in Christ, "of those called living and of those called dead," that there can be but One Church, he says, and that this Church *is* Holy. It is therefore his highest ambition to be numbered in this Holy and Catholic and Apostolic Church.

(ii) Francis is essentially "the modern man," keenly alive to the intellectual necessities and difficulties of the hour, to the need of reconstruction and restatement: he will indulge himself neither with ease nor security nor religious and emotional experience at the expense of truth: he will take no dogma upon traditional or ecclesiastical authority; yet he lays immense weight upon the authority of the holy Church. I see no tendency in him either to adopt or find satisfaction in the official

symbols of the great Eastern or Western Church; but he is gravely dissatisfied with what he considers a presumptuous liberalism that would build dogma upon the authority and experience of novices. He believes that we must be built up into the greater understanding of God not upon any new foundation which man has laid or can lay but through the personal and corporate rediscovery of the great formative experiences of the Church. He and his friends long to re-experience those great verities of his Fathers which have grown old and staled and half forgotten:

Quantis nostra fides empta laboribus!
Quam tot purpurei sanguine Martyres
Signatam, caleant ut pia pectora,
Transmisere nepotibus!

Hac spiramus adhuc, vivimus hac fide:
Hinc spes certa venit: nascitur hinc salus:
O nos degeneres, si pigeat viam
Tot tritam ducibus sequi!

Further, there is, I suppose, at this time a larger group of men in the British Free Churches than ever before, who are persuaded that they and their Churches have much to learn from the other branches of the Church and who are set together "to inquire into and appropriate the experience of all saints concerning the practice of the presence of God, the conditions, rules and graces of holy living."

(iii) This newer Churchmanship appears to have been largely kindled and fed by the discovery or rediscovery of the preciousness and right golden worth of Christian fellowship. Francis has been fortunate in finding a number of like-minded friends: their rediscovery in fellowship that two heads are better than one, that truth is not attained by controversy but by seeking to gather together partial and scattered truths; the richness that has come to their lives by reverence for each other's ideals and insight, their amazing experience of being

brought from doubt and discord to unity and certainty through corporate prayer and waiting upon God,—these things have helped to wean them in theology and religion from an arid and proud individualism to which they had been prone. Francis is now persuaded that we can only comprehend *with all saints* the immeasurable love of Christ. I understand that there are in Great Britain several groups and fellowships not unlike that to which Francis belongs. Through these partial fellowships seems to have come a fresh realization of the holy Church as a divine organism at the disposal of the Spirit, a society living a supernatural life and endowed with supernatural prerogatives.

(iv) Fourthly comes the conviction that not through voluntary agencies nor national or class movements nor social administration or legislation nor education nor through all these together but through the holy Church alone is the world to be redeemed.

Francis and his friends are well aware that the world needs to be redeemed; they are informed as to the issues at stake in China and Japan, in India and Central Africa, in Madagascar and the Pacific islands at the present moment. There is full recognition of missionary responsibility; there is a great desire amongst them, one must not say more yet, to answer this challenge to the Christian Church.

They desire too to be set for the binding up of the broken body at home, for the healing of the divisions between class and class, nation and nation. They are convinced that the so-called "social problem" is at bottom a spiritual problem, a demand for more life and for more fellowship, which life and fellowship are to be found fully in the Body of Christ alone. More immediately they are filled with shame because they see that they have been so self-satisfied and blind to intolerable social wrong; they feel that in view of social evils a new kind of discipleship is demanded of Chris-

tian men and women; they desire to seek out the will of Christ for them and as they find to follow.

(v) This strong sense of the unity of the true Church and the vastness and instancy of the task in the world before her leads Francis to a yearning for Christian unity. He sees the wastage of force in the overlapping of Christian endeavour, the hindrance to belief in the disunion and quarrels of Christians, and he feels acutely that his own spiritual life and that of his Church is the poorer because he is out of fellowship with all Christians. He is, as far as I can see, loyal and devoted to his own denomination, but he is quit for ever of the idea that union and love can spring out of controversy and polemic; it must grow, rather, through better understanding, affectionate yet critical, through trust and common prayer, through humility and teachableness of spirit, a charitable and a hospitable heart. He and his friends greatly desire such fellowship with Anglican and Roman Churchmen as may be possible; but, as they recognize that, so far as man can see, the reunion of Christendom is still far ahead, their immediate practical hope is of a Free Church of England, One, Holy and Catholic, to be ready in God's good time for that greater reunion.

II

Francis is genuinely concerned about current Free Church life and practice; he thinks he sees in himself and widespread a spirit of worldliness and ease, a lack of reverence and awe in public worship, a carelessness and forgetfulness in private; he is conscious too of a widespread ignorance and lack of Christian education especially amongst the younger people in the Churches; which calls for immediate remedy; for himself he feels the duty laid upon him to learn far more carefully and systematically to tend the life of prayer and devotion (it is here that he expects most help from "Catholic" Churches), and to seek out what may be that life of broth-

erliness and Gospel simplicity which the modern situation at home and abroad demands; his desire is to follow Christ at whatever cost.

But fundamentally and before all things there is quickened in him and his friends a great sense of God, of God Transcendent, God Immanent and God Imminent; because God is He who raised up Jesus from the dead, "the evangelization of the world in this generation" seems a feasible undertaking, an obvious possibility, the kingdom of God appears practicable—in the Resurrection power. These men have been through great experiences together; they are sure of *God*, and their great prayer is "O, that we and thy people may be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning."

III

What in fact is being done by these various groups and fellowships? Not much is to be reported yet, but that the prayers of the old people are being answered upon the young people; that groups are meeting for prayer, going into retreat to wait on God; small experiments in the ordering of worship and Christian education are being made, the ordinary work of the Church is being done a little better and with a new heart; the highway is being prepared and everywhere men and women look for His appearing in power and great glory.

In brief, there seem to be springing up all over these islands little groups, sometimes denominational, sometimes interdenominational, of men and women who are united in their sense that God is calling them to an uncompromising discipleship in faith and conduct and who long after fellowship with all those of like mind with themselves. Whither are they being led? To a new set of doctrines? Certainly not; but, I think, to a new and entirely wonderful sense of fellowship and power in prayer and devotion, of the real and illuminating and

directing presence of the Holy Spirit; not to a new belief about God but to a new faith in God; there is upon them the thrill as of men and women setting foot upon a new and unexplored continent—the unsearchable riches, the immeasurable mercies, the awful nearness of the living God. There is the spirit of youth upon Francis and his friends; they are making and will yet still more make experiments in Church life in the spirit of their common Fellowship, a spirit of loyal dissatisfaction and eager expectation. Perhaps one day we shall see arise a Free Church religious order. It is too early yet to say; it is enough that there are men and women waiting for the word to come.

Many of them, though they feel this war to be a blow at the heart of all the causes of social progress and missionary expansion they have at heart, an awful treason to the cause of humanity, yet view the issues of it with unbounded hope. More than ever this shall be the day of the Church's opportunity; this war may usher in, not only a new social order in Europe, but a new age of God, if the Church have penitence and faith and vision and devotion out of the wreckage and the failure and the disillusion to build a more enduring city.

Often before in the history of the Church has God so spoken to men and women and they have responded. But when they became unable to keep close to the heavenly leading and set their hearts upon secondary things, the vision passed and the life slipped gradually away. Where the Spirit of the Lord is and the Gospel, there is life. It is the Gospel, the good news, which makes and remakes the Church; and the Gospel is primarily the good news about the love of God. It is always so much easier to be a good "Churchman," in any sense but the highest, than to be a Christian, so much easier to run institutions than to learn humility or bring one soul to God.

Francis will not be tempted indeed consciously to

belittle the Gospel, but perhaps he will be tempted not to make it central and normal for all his Christian faith and practice. His very catholicity of temper may lead him to a too vague eclecticism, because he has no clearly defined norm whereby to test the spirits.

The evangelical faith begins here "He loved *me* and gave himself for *me*": by that tremendous experience a man is begotten into or constituted a member of the Holy Church of the redeemed, a *son* of God with all the near privilege and intimacy of a son as he is able to bear it. All the slow building of the Christian life is a working out of that salvation, that sonship given in the constitutive experience of rebirth; it is a dying to self through realization of God's unutterable love to sinful men. Further, this experience is normal for all "external" Christian activity; the mainspring of all social and missionary work is not in the last resort our love or pity or a sense of duty or the call to sacrifice, but God's love for these lost sheep.

I am less sanguine than is Francis that he will be able to take over at all "wholesale" the experience and practice of Catholic saints. Anglican and Roman Catholics have never quite understood the evangelical doctrine of faith, with its corollaries of assurance and sonship and present salvation upon which (and not upon a doctrine of the Atonement) our Christian piety grows and is built up.

Again, social work and missionary enthusiasm based on pity and chivalry and the imitation of Jesus and the "cause of Christ" will not be sufficient for the task, unless they meet man's deepest need, which is the "word of the Cross." Let Francis ever remember that the Cross is not the symbol of the sacrifice which he is to make for the saving of the world; nor of the sin of man who rejected and crucified the Christ, but of the suffering and redeeming love of God; not the sign of our attitude to God, but of His to us.

Ave verum corpus natum
Ex Maria virgine,
Vere passum, immolatum
In cruce pro homine.

God will certainly answer the faith of these men and women, who do truly and more and more believe in Him; and is not this the place to ask the prayers of Christendom, that when you pray for the rising of the tides you will remember these?[1]

[1] Any who would learn further about the point of view from which these groups and fellowships start, should see *The Challenge of the Modern Situation*, to be obtained from Mr. Malcolm Spencer, 17 Palace Road, Crouch End, London, N, and *Discipleship and the Church, a Manual for Free Churchmen*, published by Messrs. Dent.

The Neutrality of the Churches in the War Against Disease

By C.-E. A. Winslow,

Director, Division of Publicity and Education, New York State Department of Health, and Curator of Public Health, American Museum of Natural History, New York.

In the opening paragraphs of a recent article in the *Atlantic*, Mr. Henry James has touched upon the "deep illusions and fallacies" which the men and women of our generation entertained up to August, 1914. "Peace," he says, "grew to look too increasingly big, positively too massive even in its blandness for interruptions not to be afraid of it." "So it was that our faith was confirmed—violence sitting down again with averted face, and the conquests we felt the truly golden ones spreading and spreading behind its back."

A year ago the world was roughly aroused from this pleasant dream. The bonds of democracy, of finance, of humanity, which we believed confined violence were shattered. Every horror we had deemed outgrown burst forth again, more frightful than in the past, and on a more gigantic scale.

Such a crisis as that through which the world is passing stirs the mind as sharply as the emotions. It challenges our whole philosophy of life and we hesitate to be sure that we have the right password. With so much that we believed to be established, false, we question all the convictions and attitudes of the mind in which we have been comfortably resting for so long.

One such belief, which I, personally, have been forced to abandon during the last grim months, is the conviction that such a phenomenon as has overcome the world is wholly evil. Hitherto a confirmed pacifist, I have thought that war had no redeeming features of consequence, that its physical agony and economic loss were paralleled by spiritual ruin and intellectual bankruptcy. I still believe that the net effect of violence is in all its aspects evil, and I can not submit to the gospel of despair which maintains that nothing but war can furnish a tonic and stimulus for national vitality. Yet, whatever is lost, it is quite clear that much is being gained, by the nations now in conflict; whatever has been put to sleep, spiritual forces of power and beauty are being awakened.

No one can read with open mind and heart the private letters written from the trenches, no one can consider how the women of France and England and Germany and Russia are carrying their burden, without recognizing that there are splendid new moral values displayed on every hand. Men and women alike, who were listless and selfish and petty, have been energized by the crisis into enthusiasm and devotion. "This is a great time,"—we hear the words solemnly and reverently spoken in every country that is at war; and it is a moral and spiritual, not a material greatness, that is touching the hearts of the men and women who give themselves so freely. The individual need has been caught up and fused into a larger loyalty.

Even in our own country, in the penumbral shadows of the great struggle, we have caught a glimpse of the same vision. Even here we have been shaken out of our apathy into straighter thinking and keener earnestness and deeper insight into the eternal things. I suspect that many a man and woman in this neutral nation has during the past few months made unaccustomed prayers.

If we grant then that the crisis of war has its high spiritual values, we must ask whether these values may

not be secured at some less terrible cost. Old proverbs notwithstanding, the history of human progress is full of examples of the development of thornless roses. The central task of civilization, rightly understood, is perhaps to solve this very problem, to sift and refine the natural forces of the universe, to secure the beauty and escape the sting. When man gained the knowledge of good and evil he earned, not only a curse, but a share in the Divine task of creation.

Can the moral and spiritual values of war be gained without its sufferings and waste and degradation? Can the nations be kept instinct with self-sacrificing service when the times of peace return?

I quoted from one of the three brilliant Jameses to emphasize the intellectual upheaval into which we have been thrown by the world war. To a second of these brothers, were he still with us, we should turn for help in constructing a new world upon the ruins of the old; and our central question, formulated above, he has already answered for us in detail.

"Militarism," he grants,[1] "is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood, and human life with no use for hardihood would be contemptible. . . . So long as anti-militarists propose no substitute for war's disciplinary function, no *moral equivalent of war*, analogous, as one might say, to the mechanical equivalent of heat, so long they fail to realize the full inwardness of the situation."

Professor James himself was confident that this need not be so, that

"the martial type of character can be bred without war. Strenuous honor and disinterestedness abound elsewhere. Priests and medical men are in a fashion educated to it, and we should all feel some degree of it imperative if we were conscious of our work as an obligatory service to the state."

To enforce this consciousness, he suggested

"a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against *Nature*. . . . To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets in December,

[1] Essay on The Moral Equivalent of War in Memories and Studies, 1911.

to dish-washing, clothes-washing, and window-washing, to road-building and tunnel-making, to foundries and stoke-holes, and to the frames of sky-scrapers, would our gilded youths be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas. They would have paid their blood-tax, done their own part in the immemorial human warfare against nature; they would tread the earth more proudly, the women would value them more highly, they would be better fathers and teachers of the following generation."

"The only thing needed henceforth" to secure the moral values of war "is to inflame civic temper as past history has inflamed the military temper."

What are the forces under which each of the nations of Europe has been welded into a glowing unit of devotion and self-sacrifice,—forces which we must somehow call into being in everyday living if such ideals as these are to be realized?

First of all the consciousness of common danger seems to be the one all-compelling influence which is most potent in raising nations to a high level of community endeavour. In the past, nations have gone to war for conquest, for revenge, for excitement, for a dozen reasons; but in the present crisis, whatever subconscious forces may be at work, the masses, in each nation at war, believe that they are engaged in a struggle for self-defense. The lives, the property and the honour of each are believed by its citizens to be in imminent danger; and this sense of a common menace, which appeals to the baser instincts of personal fear, rouses at the same time the most splendid motives of devotion and self-sacrifice.

It is because in our ordinary daily life we are not conscious of any such pressing danger that we become slack and frivolous and selfish, so that the militarist calls for war to bring in the greater things as on the wings of a mighty wind. Yet, as in the case of Sir Launfal, the supreme motive lies hidden all about us in our daily lives.

Let us consider whether we are really so free from common dangers in the daily life of peace. *The New York Sun*

estimates the losses of life from military operations during the twelve months of the war as follows:

Austria-Hungary	700,000
France	960,000
Germany	1,000,000
Great Britain	300,000
Russia	1,600,000
Total	4,560,000

The same countries lost in peace times the following numbers of lives, the figures being for the year 1909 in the case of Russia and for the year 1912 in the other countries:

Austria-Hungary	1,084,148
France	692,740
Germany	1,029,749
Great Britain (United Kingdom only)	631,466
Russia (European)	3,374,915
Total	6,813,018

One can not of course stress this comparison too heavily. The war estimates are undoubtedly incomplete. Furthermore, they represent the most vigorous of young adult manhood, and thus count more heavily against the future of the race than five times the same number of deaths distributed at random among the whole population. Yet the figures serve to remind us that even in peace there is a loss of life going on which is of somewhat the same order of magnitude as the destruction wrought by this most far-reaching and terrible of wars.

We ignore this deadly warfare of daily life against disease because it is so familiar and because, in the past, its fatal results were felt to be inevitable. We know today that this is no longer true. The Report of the Committee of 100 on the Conservation of National Vitality estimated with all reasonable conservatism that 40 per cent of the million and a half deaths which occur in the United States each year could be prevented, by the application of the

knowledge of hygiene and sanitation which we now possess.

This needless death rate year by year is indeed a real and a terrible community danger; and the struggle against it, a cause which, if rightly presented, might well serve as an incentive to the same quickened and ennobled sense of common responsibility which war calls forth.

This is not yet the root of the matter however. Men do not go to war to avoid being killed or even primarily to prevent their fellows from being killed. They go to war to defend their national honour, their national civilization, their ways of thinking and living and doing. If we could see all the fruits of our own society that have been cut off and lost as a result of premature death we should, I think, find that the injury to our civilization by disease is in the aggregate as deep as any which a foreign conqueror could work. As to honour, we may doubt whether it is really less contemptible, to let our fellow citizens die through our own ignorance and neglect, from the attacks of microbes or of preventable degenerative disease, than to fail to protect them from the attacks of human foes.

To quote again from William James,

"Men now are proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their persons and their wealth, if by so doing they may fend off subjection. But who can be sure that *other aspects of one's country* may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame? Why should men not some day feel that it is worth a blood-tax to belong to a collectivity superior in *any* ideal respect? Why should they not blush with indignant shame if the community that owns them is vile in any way whatsoever? Individuals, daily more numerous, now feel this civic passion. It is only a question of blowing on the spark till the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honor, a stable system of morals of civic honor builds itself up."

In order to present the warfare against disease as it really is,—to bring it down from the realm of abstract statistics and inevitable fate,—it is necessary to consider concrete and definite cases.

Perhaps the most appealing of our needless deaths are those which occur in such alarming numbers among young infants. There is a profound significance about all childhood. There may be no Shakespeares or Lincolns in the cradles of today; but there are babies who will grow (if they live) to be great men and women. There are poets and statesmen and religious teachers. There are revealers of the mysteries of Nature; and among the babies who rest in their mothers' arms we may be sure that there are some whose life is fraught with special powers of blessing for the lives and souls of men.

A baby is a precious thing because it may hold in its tiny hands gifts for mankind, far more precious than gold, frankincense and myrrh. There is another and a deeper reason, however, for the call which the cause of the child must make to every Christian man. Service to the weak and the needy is the heart and the soul of our faith, if that faith be the faith of Christ; and the helplessness of childhood calls for our service and our sacrifice with a stronger appeal than any other need. This lesson, which Christ taught, when he set a little child in the midst of his disciples, is written in the foundations of nature, in the care of an insect for its young, in the loyalty of a bird to its nest, in the pathetic devotion with which even the weakest of animals will give its life in the defense of its offspring. "It is not the will of your Father which is in Heaven, that one of these little ones should perish."

Yet even today, with all the fruits of public health science at our disposal, a quarter of a million infants die in the United States each year before they reach the first year of life; while nothing is more certain than that nearly half of these infant deaths are preventable, and by simple and specific means.

An editorial published last spring in the monthly bulletin of the New York State Department of Health calls upon us to realize what this loss of infant lives really signifies.

"Consider a single case, as if the actors in the tragedy were real people—as they are.

"Think of it all as the young father does who is sitting looking out into the night, listening to the footsteps upstairs and waiting for the doctor's verdict. His mind goes back over the last few years—to his courting and the long wait before he could afford to be married—to the new job, and the wedding it made possible, and the settling in the new home. He remembers the day when his wife told him she was to be a mother, he remembers the family counsels and how the women of the family were busy all winter working on little white garments.

"At last one night,—which comes back to him as if it were yesterday,—there was a new voice in the house, a shrill cry (so different from the moaning of sickness) that meant a man was born into the world. His wife had a little warm, pink bundle at her breast and he walked to his shop with a proud step and head in the air and the grandparents hovered over the Baby and put their big fingers between his soft, clinging ones and tickled his fat dimples to make him laugh and crow.

"His wife's whole soul had been wrapped up in the mite, but she knew nothing about how to take care of him except what she was told by her mother and her older friends. By their advice she had put him on the bottle and had given him milk substitutes, patent 'baby foods,' because he was not doing as well as she would wish. By their advice she had kept him swathed in hot diapers and flannel clothes and shut the window to protect him from the draught. All wrong!—the Doctor said—now that it was too late.

"Then the warm weather had come and baby had seemed poorly. He cried fretfully and lay awake at night. 'That's nothing,' the neighbors said, 'he's only getting his teeth.' So no doctor was called in. At last, a week ago, he was taken acutely sick and now the little life was hanging in the balance. Could it be that their Baby was to die—all because they had not known?"

We can no longer shift the blame for this waste of infant life upon that conception of a blind force which, even among Christians, until lately represented the terrors of the heathen fates. Sir William Osler, when in Baltimore, rebuked a mother who told him that "Providence had taken away her little baby" that had died from a prevalent children's disease known as "summer complaint" by saying, "It was not God; it was dirty milk that killed your baby." Dr. Holt of New York City asks,

"Does God fix the death rate? Once, men were taught so, and death was regarded as an act of Divine Providence, often inscrutable. We are now coming to look upon a high infant mortality as evidence of human weakness, ignorance and cupidity. We believe that Providence works through human agencies and that in this field, as in others, we reap what we sow—no more and no less."

The needless deaths of infants, as Dr. Holt has said in another place, are due to the twin causes of Ignorance and Poverty. Their prevention depends primarily on the education of the mother, and an effective and well proved technique has been devised to meet this need. Infant mortality is measured by the ratio of deaths under one year of age to 1,000 births and two instances will serve to show how largely this portion of the death rate is under our control.

The infant mortality rate in New York City in the year 1907 was 144 deaths under one year per 1,000 births. In 1908 a special Division of Child Hygiene was created to cope with this evil. Infant welfare stations were established to teach the mothers how to care for their babies, with a corps of visiting nurses to carry the beneficent instruction into the homes. The result was an immediate and progressive drop in the infant mortality rate of the city which brought it down from 144 in 1907 to 94 in 1914.

Sanitary administration in New York State outside of New York City was not of a high degree of efficiency prior to 1914. In that year Dr. Hermann M. Biggs, who as Chief Medical Officer of the New York City Health Department had been chiefly responsible for its remarkable progress, became State Commissioner of Health. A vigorous educational campaign for infant welfare was now inaugurated throughout the State. Again the result was immediate. As compared with the first seven months of 1913 the infant death rate for the first seven months of 1915 had fallen from 127 to 97 deaths per 1,000 births. If this rate is maintained for the remainder of the year it will mean a saving of more than 2,500 infant lives.

The prevention of infant mortality is of course only one of the fields of public health work, though perhaps the one which carries the strongest appeal. The children who escape the ordinary perils of infancy are exposed to the attacks of communicable diseases, of scarlet fever and measles and whooping cough and diphtheria. These four

diseases taken together kill about 40,000 people each year in the United States, and there are two common misconceptions about them which do much to contribute to their continued prevalence. First there is the lightness with which two of these affections, measles and whooping cough, are commonly regarded. Yet there are more deaths in most communities from each of these disorders than from scarlet fever, and nearly as many as from typhoid fever. Secondly, there is the tradition that they are inevitable, and that they might as well be experienced and gotten through with as soon as possible. This is a superstition which has slain its tens of thousands; for it is among young children that these maladies are likely to pass on to a fatal termination, and each year for which an attack can be postponed is so much gained.

These communicable diseases are in the main, spread in two ways, by direct contact with an earlier case, often in an incipient and unrecognized stage, or by the drinking of milk which has been specifically polluted by such a case. Contact may be controlled by the prompt isolation of those affected, so that the deadly chain of communication may be broken; and milk may be made safe by pasteurization, a precaution which should everywhere and always be enforced, since unheated milk is never free from possible danger.

In the case of diphtheria we have not only these primary lines of defense, but also a second safeguard of impregnable strength in the form of antitoxin treatment. The use of antitoxin in the first days of this disease almost invariably prevents a fatal result and has reduced the diphtheria death rate in the United States from 70 per 100,000 population in 1890 to 18 per 100,000 in 1912. Yet even the rate of 18 per 100,000 is a reproach to us, for it means that there are nearly 20,000 deaths each year in the United States due to the neglect of one of the most efficient weapons which public health science has placed in our hands.

When the army of civil life is actually mustered in for active service, at the beginning of productive adult life, two other enemies, typhoid fever and tuberculosis, make their great frontal attacks. Typhoid fever is being brilliantly and successfully controlled by water purification and waste disposal, by the pasteurization of milk and by the use of the invaluable antityphoid vaccine. The death rate from this disease has been decreased from 46 per 100,000 in 1890 to 16 per 100,000 in 1912 and is falling rapidly each year.

Against tuberculosis on the other hand, our campaign progresses at a much less satisfactory rate. The gains of the past have indeed been notable. A death rate of 245 per 100,000 population in 1890 has been reduced to 149 in 1912. Yet in the last few years the rate of reduction has slackened or has been wholly checked, while tuberculosis still causes each year 150,000 deaths in the United States, of which two-thirds should be prevented. The great wave of enthusiasm with which the campaign against this disease was launched ten years ago has largely spent its force although it has only partly attained its splendid goal. It would surely be a surrender of the honour and the vital interests of any nation to submit to such a check. We know how the battle may be won. Sanatoria are needed for the cure of early cases, and hospitals for the isolation of advanced cases, of this disease. Nurses must be provided to spy out the enemy, to detect the incipient victims in a curable stage, and to instruct them in the essentials of defense against their subtle foe. The living and working conditions of the poor, the crowded tenement and the dusty, ill-ventilated factory, are potent allies of the tubercle bacillus; and these too must be attacked in a vigorous offensive warfare if we are to succeed.

Finally, the veterans of our civil army, who have resisted all these earlier attacks, are exposed to their own peculiar dangers. Diseases of the heart and arteries, Bright's disease and cancer, carry off 300,000 men and

women each year in the United States; and, while at all other points on the battle line we are at least holding our own, these diseases of middle life appear among American males to be actually on the increase.

Most of these degenerative diseases can not be prevented, in the complete sense in which we can prevent the communicable diseases of early life. Old age will prevail in time. The needless thing is that old age so often comes on prematurely. In a group of supposedly normal commercial employees examined by the Life Extension Institute of New York (average age 30 years) it is reported that 36 per cent showed evidence of urinary disease or disorder, while 26 per cent had abnormal blood pressures and 13 per cent hardened arteries.

Such untimely developments of degenerative disease are not incidents of normal old age, but are the penalties of abuse of the laws of hygiene,—of too little exercise or too little fresh air, of overeating or overworking, or of excesses along other lines. They are not beyond our control. The progress of diseases of the heart and arteries, and kidneys, may, if the trouble be detected promptly, be restricted by the hygienic adjustment of the individual life under proper medical direction. Even cancer may in many cases be completely cured by a surgical operation, if taken in time, while it is rarely curable by other means, or later in its course. It is the conviction of the foremost medical authorities that if every person over 45 would consult a competent physician once a year and have a complete examination made to detect the beginning of disease and receive a prescription, not of medicine, but of a regimen of personal hygiene, five years would be added to the average adult life.

Shall the churches remain neutral in this daily and many-sided War Against Disease?

There are many of course who feel that the churches have but little direct interest in such fields of practical endeavour. Only last summer I heard a Bishop refer to

the call to social service as a "magnificent but dangerous one" and dwell at length on the fact that this tempting field was not "the first duty of the Church". It added an ironic touch that he was preaching from the text "He that doeth My works shall know My doctrine" as applied to the personal life.

I can not myself conceive, however, that it is possible successfully to separate the religious impulse, and the individual morality to which it leads, from the practical problems of social responsibility.

In past times the churches had no illusions as to the oneness of the religious and the social life. Catholic bishops and Puritan pastors carried their convictions into the heart of daily affairs, and ascetics testified by their development of the religious life to the same conviction,—that religion works, not in a vacuum, but in a human society. Only, instead of trying to dominate the society in which they found themselves, they took the easier way of creating a new society of their own.

It is quite true that the principle of Theocracy was carried to extremes and broke under the strain. I suspect, however, that the reaction may have gone too far and that more men and women than we suspect are ready, —not for ecclesiastical domination,—but for active and direct moral leadership by the churches in the social problems of the day.

The hitching shed behind a New England meeting house is to me suggestive of a profoundly significant element in religion. It is indeed the "meeting" house, the place to which the farmers from miles around drove up in the old days for the supreme social event of their quiet lives. It was the centre of communal existence, the force that more than any other made for a sense of mutual relationship, of civic life.

The telephone and the automobile have changed all that. The social problems of today are more complex ones. In regard to the specific methods by which broad

ends may be attained, the churches need the counsel of competent expert authority. Yet the essential principle remains a sound one, that the Church, which represents the spiritual and moral forces of the world, should be, not a side issue, but the very heart and centre of the social and political, forces of progress.

Let us consider very briefly what this means in its application to the war against disease.

First of all, I believe that the priest, pastor, minister, (wonderful words whose significance we oftentimes forget) might well feel an official responsibility for the health conditions of his community,—in New York or London as well as in the missionary districts of China. He should know the infant mortality rate of his own town and of his own district in the town. If it is over 100 deaths under one year per 1,000 births there is a direct and impelling call for his service; and in prosperous communities the rate can and should be brought down to 50 instead of 100. He should know what the typhoid fever death rate is, and what it means. If there are more than 15 deaths from typhoid per 100,000 population he may be sure that the water supply or milk supply or the supervision of the production and handling of food or the bedside care of the sick requires attention. In northern cities where the population is predominantly of the white race, the rate may be kept down to 10.

The tuberculosis death rate and the total death rate from all causes are harder to interpret, because they are so profoundly modified by the racial composition and the social and industrial status of the population. It has been pointed out above that the death rate from tuberculosis in the Registration area of the United States is about 150 per 100,000; and the total death rate from all causes in 1913 was 14.1 per 1,000 (or 1,410 per 100,000). Local conditions will materially modify these rates; but from health authorities or the officers of anti-tuberculosis and other public health societies the clergymen can learn

whether local rates are decreasing as they should and how they compare with those of other communities similarly constituted.

The mobilization of a people in a democratic country requires public education of a persistent and far-reaching sort; and this is as true in our war against disease as in the raising of England's volunteer army. The churches can aid our recruiting in innumerable ways. Broader issues may be treated from the pulpit itself, and the Sunday school, the club and guild gatherings and the publications of the parish offer admirable opportunities for bringing to the individual the knowledge which he needs to defend his own health and to guard that of his neighbour.

Finally, the churches might well, I believe, take definite and constructive part in building up the sanitary fortifications of the community and securing munitions of war for the conflict with disease. They might see to it that in their neighbourhood there is a properly equipped infant welfare station to teach to mothers the essentials of maternal care, so that the death rate of infants may be lessened. They might secure the provision of public health nurses and of adequate hospital accommodation for the isolation and the cure of cases of pulmonary tuberculosis. They could demand a pure public water supply and such a disposal of wastes as shall not endanger the health of their own or any other community. They could labour for the distribution of supplies of clean pasteurized milk. They could stand firmly for generously supported non-political and expert health administration.

Beyond these immediate and comparatively simple objectives the public health movement tends increasingly to open up new vistas of more remote but vitally important problems. General Gorgas conquered malaria and yellow fever by draining marshes and destroying mosquitoes; but when he attacked pneumonia at Panama and in South Africa he found that he must improve the housing conditions and raise the salaries of the workers.

No one can go far in attempting to control infant mortality and tuberculosis without being brought face to face with grave questions of industrial and social reconstruction. These problems are most delicate and most complex ones. They require for their solution not only patience and open-mindedness, but the definite knowledge and grasp of fundamentals that can come only from expert study. Yet these same problems involve moral issues of the most vital sort. The details must be worked out by specialists; but the driving force should be the living inspiration of religion.

The essential thing which we public health workers want the churches to realize is that this war against disease is something very real and very immediate.

In one of John B. Gough's lectures (*Social Responsibilities*) he tells the following story:

"I once saw a man sold, and I stood by the auction block, while my wife, at a hundred yards' distance, was trying to comfort a little mulatto woman, because her master would not let her see her husband again. A trader from the south wanted to take the man down the river, and a benevolent man in the vicinity wanted to buy him to keep him with his wife and child. I shall never forget the look of agony with which he gazed upon the trader, and then the ray of hope that seemed to illumine his face as he looked upon his friend; but, presently, the trader offered a sum that shut out all hope, for his friend turned upon his heel and departed. Then that man folded his arms, and I saw the twitching of the fingers, and I saw the convulsive workings of the throat; I saw the white tooth brought upon the lip, as if it would press the blood from under it; I saw the eyelids swollen with unshed tears; I saw the veins standing out like whipcords upon his brow, and the drops like beads upon his forehead."

Dr. Charles J. Hastings, the Health Officer of Toronto, has quoted this passage in striking illustration of the significance of the public health campaign. Every physician, he said, has been a participant in just such a struggle as depicted by the temperance orator. He has seen the sick man hesitating on the verge of exile from all the world of known familiar things, while wife and children face the agony of separation. He has bid for the life hanging trembling in the balance to the utmost of his medical

skill. He has at last recognized the final bid of Death, too strong to be met by any human effort; and he has known that it was because of the neglect of simple preventive measures, days or months or years before, that this tragedy has come to pass.

Over half a million such preventable deaths take place in the United States each year. The churches, if they will, can rouse our people and the people of other countries to a crusade against disease which would be the most fruitful war the world has ever known; and the preaching of such a crusade would go far to bring the uplifting forces of social loyalty into the life of Peace.

Comment on Professor Winslow's Paper

By Major-General W. C. Gorgas.

I am in entire accord with the trend of Prof. Winslow's argument, and believe that sanitation could be greatly advanced by church organizations taking an active part in spreading a wide knowledge among the people of elementary sanitary science. It would be very useful everywhere in the American tropics to have all the people know that yellow fever is spread only by the bite of the female stegomyia mosquito, and also to have every one know how easily the stegomyia mosquito could be entirely gotten rid of. It would be very advantageous, wherever malaria prevails, to have every one know and believe that malaria is spread by the female anopheles mosquito, and also to have them know how the anopheles mosquito can be made to disappear.

The various church organizations would be most useful auxiliaries to the sanitarian in spreading this knowledge, and in getting the people to thoroughly believe in it. But I could not help wondering, while reading Prof. Winslow's article, whether the sanitarian himself had not been lacking in his sanitary teaching, and whether the churches, as a matter of fact, were not much in advance of the sanitarian in really basic sanitary endeavour.

Poverty is, after all, the greatest enemy to the health and well-being of the human race.

All increase of wages tends directly toward the decrease of poverty, and, therefore, to the improvement of health conditions, and the more wages can be increased

the greater will be the improvement, other things being equal, in the sanitation of the community under consideration. There is, of course, a limit beyond which it would be impossible to increase the wages of a community generally, and beyond which it would be unjust and unfair to attempt such increase. If there were only a single human being in this world, it would be very easy to determine what his wages should be. In fact no power, except his own will, could affect his wages. He would be entitled to, and would get, all he produced. Nothing more and nothing less. This I should call natural wages. The same law of right holds, no matter how many human beings live on the earth's surface. Each one of these human beings is by right entitled to all he produces, and he is wronged when, in our complicated civilization, he gets anything less than he produces.

If in any modern community every individual could get as wages all he produces, poverty would be greatly lessened and sanitation greatly improved. Justice, therefore, in the matter of wages is the most important health measure that the sanitarian could possibly put into effect. Justice for the past two thousand years has been enforced by the teachings of Christianity as one of its basic principles.

The greatest Teacher of morality and religion the world has ever known impressed upon His disciples that to Caesar should be rendered that which belonged to Caesar. Now I am inclined to think that much more good would be accomplished if sanitarians would join the churches in teaching the desirability and need of justice in the relations of mankind, and more particularly of justice in regard to wages, than if the churches joined the sanitarian in teaching special measures of sanitation, such as those in regard to malaria and yellow fever.

After we have once corrected our social conditions so that we all get natural wages, the existing poverty of

the higher civilizations will be greatly alleviated. We can then teach with greater prospect of success special methods of sanitation. The pupil will then be better able to understand this teaching, and when he has learned and understood sanitation he will be financially able to carry it into effect. It seems to me, therefore, that the wise and just course for both the churches and sanitarians is to join forces in advancing in their various communities every measure that tends to increase wages, and to bend their principal endeavours in this direction, until natural wages have been obtained for every member of that community.

I do not mean to advocate the stopping of the teaching of special measures of sanitation, but merely to call attention to the fact that sanitary attainment has a very definite limit, beyond which it can not advance as long as the poverty of a large portion of the community remains as abject as it is at present among all our great civilized nations. When this poverty has been abated to such extent as will obviously occur, when each individual gets natural wages, then sanitation would advance far beyond anything that has occurred in the past.

Every individual in a community will automatically get all he produces, unless he is deprived of it by some force outside of himself. Now let us all, both churchmen and sanitarians, endeavour to discover what these forces are, and remove them. The churchman, if you will, because he wants to improve morals and give justice. The sanitarian because he wants to improve health, both appreciating that the alleviation of poverty is the greatest single step in the cause which he so ardently wishes advanced.

"Man, Nature, and God"

By Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D., LL.D.,
Editor-in-Chief of the Catholic Encyclopedia.

It was Christmas Day. All around me sat devout worshippers attentively following the progress of the Mass. The joy of Christmas was reflected in every countenance. Now the celebrant had reached the Preface and in a clear voice he intoned the words, *Per omnia saecula saeculorum*, and behind me the choir mostly made up of young lads and misses unaccompanied by the organ answered, *Amen*, softly and gently. Every voice struck the note which the priest had indicated. Not a discord, not a flaw in the harmony. Shortly after in the adjoining schoolhouse some hundred children's voices repeated the strains of a hymn sung for them by their teacher and again every note that reached our ear was true and correct.

Well, our reader may say, what is there remarkable in all this? We have often heard similar feats in church and in school; we have often heard the thrush or the finch when intoning their sweet anthems do so in the very same key in which some tuneful neighbour perched on a nearby branch had been ringing forth its sweetest songs. But why wonder at this; it is common enough in the country. True. I myself have often heard and admired these concerts nature provides for us and have been charmed by them. They had appealed to my sense of the beautiful, they had spoken to my heart on such occasions, but now they speak to my mind, they arrest my thought and my intellect begins to ask questions. It is remarkable, said I to myself, that these

hundred children should repeat at once and without flaw the same notes which the teacher had sung before, and at first I dwelt rather on the fact that among so many voices there was not a single false tone, though, of course, it happens often enough that the scholars' repetition of the teacher's note is not true; but that is only an accident. My mind just now dwelt on other problems. Usually when we hear sounds, whether the gentle strains of a church hymn or the shrill notes of the factory whistle or the sighing of the wind in the pine branches or the deep rolling of the thunder, we think mostly of the quality of the impression produced upon us and the source from which that impression comes.

The impression may be agreeable or disagreeable; it may be soothing or even terrible. We seldom think how that impression is produced. Still, to the thinking mind, this little word *how* is more interesting than all the sweetness or the terror of the impression. The factory whistle juts out from the roof, it moves not, it only sends forth a volume of steam and forthwith I am startled by a slow, shaking scream, as it were. A hundred feet away from me stands the violinist. I see him make some passes with his bow over his fiddle strings and forthwith the dulcet tones of his instrument awaken within me the most soothing, charming sounds. It is not the motion of the bow that impresses me, for the artist may make the same passes therewith in the air; it is not the fiddle, for no inspiring sound leaves that unless the bow by its friction causes the strings to vibrate. Without the vibration of the strings there is no response in my ear. But the violin is a hundred feet away and neither it nor the bow have contact with my ear either inside or out of it. What is the medium between the violin strings and my hearing apparatus? Science tells us it is the air. We do not see the air move, we do not feel the air stir. Yet science tells us that we hear because the vibrations of the in-

strument's chords cause undulation of the sea of air between it and the hearer. Just as a stone thrown into a placid lake makes the water move in ever-increasing circles, so the vibrations of the violin call forth ever-broadening circular undulations of the air which form so to say the movable bridge between the instrument and the ear. Sound, science tells us, the simplest sound, travels at the rate of nearly 1200 feet a second; that is to say, while I slowly count one, the atmospheric undulations travel nearly a quarter of a mile. This is astonishing but it is not all. Were the violin to produce but a single tone we might find the undulations described a possible explanation but the player produces now one tone then another, sometimes high, sometimes low, and each of these means a modification of the basic undulation, just as a passenger moving in a railroad train adds his own motion to the general movement of the train, producing complicated lines of movement which only a mathematician can unravel. But even this is not all. As the notes rise to stirring power or sink and almost die away again, the sounding air waves are modified so as to produce in turn the impression of power or the impression of softness. Even yet we have not completed the series of changes which our undulating atmosphere may simultaneously undergo, producing all the varied impressions to which the human voice or the artist's instruments may give rise, from the clear to the muffled sound, from the open to the nasal, from the rapid to the slow, to mention only a few of the modifications, of which sound, that is to say, the undulating air, is capable.

Now whence did the atmosphere derive this capacity to be changed or modified? Who gave it the laws according to which it must always move at a certain speed and according to which let us say the octave of a note requires twice as many vibrations as the note itself, and the third, five-fourths as many? Who

counts these waves and apportions these undulations? Who is the wizard that bestowed upon it the power of assuming, so to say, so many Protean forms? Have we any reason to think that the air has made itself and endowed itself with such marvellous powers? That, unlike other matter which science tells us is inert and dead, air has the power of life or self-motion? All analogy is against it. Science knows of no reasons why inert air should be able to endow itself with life and endow itself with the marvellously rapid motion and manifold modifications of which it is capable. Science declares that inertia is an essential energy of the air as it is of all other matter, that it does not move itself, that it does not arrange itself, that it does not bestow upon itself motion or the laws of its motion. It must, therefore, derive these from an external cause and that cause must possess power extending to wherever there is air, and must be capable of producing all the manifold mathematical arrangements which, science assures us, determine the pitch of musical notes and of all the manifold laws which control the qualities of sound. That cause therefore must be both extensive and wise; it must have profound and minute mathematical knowledge, understand the relation of numbers, appreciate the qualities of the curves embodied in the sound waves, have a keen insight into the effects of rapid and of slow motion, of regular and irregular movement in the air. We have indicated a few items of the deep and complicated knowledge that must belong to the being that is the author of sound. Let us now turn to another side of our problem.

The sound of which we have briefly sketched the nature and more obvious characteristics is the object of man's sense of hearing. Whatever we hear we call a sound. Our sense of hearing is not sound, is not mere motion, regular or irregular. Science tells us that our sense of hearing makes use of various instruments,

so arranged as to be able to appreciate the sound waves and many of their modifications; we do not say all, for on the one hand experience teaches that all men do not receive the same impressions from sound, and photography has taught us that there are light waves to which the photographic film is sensitive while our eyes are dead to their action. But there is no doubt that some power or cause has provided us with organs able to be impressed by some of the most delicate features of air movement or sound. These organs readily perceive not only the softest and sweetest of sounds, the sighing of the pine, the warbling of the nightingale, the pianissimo of the prima donna, but also the roaring of the cataract and the rolling of the thunder. They are so constructed that they distinguish at once the regular movement of the air which we call a musical note from its irregular stir which we call a noise. Nay, more, our organs of hearing are so built up that they can measure the relation of number which the cause of sound has laid down in the sound waves and which we call the note of the gamut. In short, the construction of our hearing apparatus, from the lobes of the outer ear to harplike strings of Corti's organ, so science tells us, is built so as exactly to be the measure of the manifold and complicated movements of the sound wave.

The organs of the ear, therefore, are essentially the measure of sound and all its qualities, just as the face of a watch is the measure of the complicated movements of the works. Now, who that understands that the face of a watch is a measure of the movements of its works, would doubt that the same intelligent cause designed both the works and the face? Must we not, therefore, also infer that the same intelligent cause which devised the complications of sound and its movements must have devised also the organs of human hearing which are its measure? Now what

sane man is there who would declare that he has made his own ear or that his father and mother have made it for him? But if he will declare that some power endowed with the necessary knowledge and ability has made the ear, then that same power must be the cause of sounds, musical and unmusical, of the vast ocean of air, the movements of which constitute sound, for all the complications detected by the ear in the movement of sound waves are in a way repeated in the complex arrangements of the organism we call our ear. Nay more, the arrangement of the organism and the complex movement of the sound waves, with all their modifications, are so precisely adapted to each other that our ear, though it does not count the waves, let us say, in the various notes of the gamut, nevertheless forthwith recognizes the presence or absence of the arithmetical relations demanded by the laws of physics in the number of waves constituting the various notes of a scale. For the everyday arithmetician, nay, even for the most genial mathematician, this power which our ear possesses of so to say instantaneously counting and identifying the number of vibrations in the moving air appears marvellous enough. Yet we certainly possess this power; for if the pupil correctly repeats the musical phrase of his teacher, or if the choir immediately responds to the intonation of the priest in the same key, it is only because they have recognized the musical key in which the latter sung; in other words, because they have counted correctly the number and speed of the vibrations that reached their ears. But this is only half of the marvel. The answering choirmaster has not only correctly counted the vibrations in the priest's chant but immediately and unfailingly he has ordered and set in motion the hundreds of nerves and muscles whose action is needed to reproduce correctly the notes of the chant. Within a few seconds, therefore, the nerve apparatus of the ear perceives all the

complicated relations of the sound waves, and the muscles of the lungs, throat and mouth execute all the movements required to cause a second set of aerial undulations mathematically and arithmetically corresponding to the first. In all this we are merely the instrument of a cause far more intelligent and powerful than ourselves. Someone counts the vibrations in the musical note or it would be out of harmony with its predecessor. The average singer does not even know how many vibrations there are in the various notes of the gamut. If the counting and comparing of numbers then implies intelligence and if the movement of our muscles implies energy, then the power or cause or being which controls and directs our vocal organs is both intelligent and endowed with energy. This energy, moreover, extends as far as the great ocean of air extends, for wherever there is air, there man can produce sound and sing.

II

It is a bright clear summer night. Around us all is impressive silence; men have retired and the sweet singing birds have gone to rest. I turn my eyes heavenward and forthwith I hear the music of the spheres and am charmed by the gentle rays of the silent moon and dazzled by the sparkle of the million stars. Solemn and silent they speak to me a language full of impressiveness and awe, a language of mystery and light, filling me with a sense of a hundred profound problems. They speak not to our ears but to our eyes; they tell us the wonders of light, the wonders of colour, displaying to us the subdued blue of the sky, the pale white of the moon and the glorious red of Mars and Betelgeuze in Orion. Around us their light reveals the soft green of the trees and the grass, the browns of the rocks and the glittering reflections of the rippling stream or the spreading lake. My mind is filled with a sense

of greatness and beauty, and instinctively I call on my friends to share my deep and lofty emotions. We all see and admire the glories of the heavens; my comrades' eyes like mine are stirred with sensations of the grand and the sublime, of the mysterious and the impressive. Young and old, learned and unlearned, feel the charms of this great revelation and wonder at its meaning.

What is its meaning to the intellect of the philosopher and to the observing search of the scientist? If to the untutored minds the glories of the night and its light are bewildering, their marvels are not less impressive for the man of thought though they may be of a different order. Indeed, these wonders, instead of being lessened by scientific examination, grow more astonishing. Where the plain man sees thousands of miles, the scientist sees hundreds of millions; where the layman sees unrelated points and dots, the savant sees the sources of rippling motion stretching for distances which it is difficult to express in figures and impossible to conceive as quantities. For light, science tells us, like sound is undulating motion, only, while in the case of sound it is the air that vibrates, in the case of light it is the mysterious ether; and while the vibrations of sound travel at the rate of a quarter of a mile per second, the luminous vibrations of the ether speed on their way at the rate of almost 190,000 miles per second. This rippling motion is constant and uniform, and, like the concentric ripples caused in the placid lake by the dropping stone, the light waves move, equal in size and equal in speed, and the number of waves per second is ever the same. But the character of these waves varies in the most marvellous manner. We know that through the telegraphic wire two and even more currents of electricity may pass, either in the same or in opposite directions, without interfering with each other; we know that in wireless telegraphy many electric vibrations may cross or run parallel to each other

without destroying their characteristic motion; similarly the wave of light may be modified by various currents combining, separating or crossing, giving rise by their new undulations to all the endless variations of colour and tone, of strength and softness. Let us not forget that every colour means a uniform number of light waves per second, and that in all this bewildering mass of movement there reigns absolute, undeviating regularity. Let us bear in mind that the millions of equal ripples which constitute the light and the colours of the light, its dulness or its brilliancy or its iridescence, all mean new systems of motion, differing in direction but harmonizing in result, each with its apportioned number of vibrations and the whole a veritable mathematical puzzle, in which the numbers of the vibrations never change and the directions are ever true. It is a very witch's cauldron of regularity and law. Has all this puzzling harmony a cause or has it no cause? But where is there an effect without cause, and, if it have a cause, is the cause in or outside of the ether? Now ether, science tells us, is matter, and matter, science tells us, is inert. The cause of the phenomena of light, therefore, is not inside but outside of the ether. This cause plans and apportions and arranges and orders. It is possessed of intelligence.

Now let us look at the reverse of the medal. What would all this wonderful harmony and order of number and motion be to us, were we not provided with an organism able to perceive and a judgment able to appreciate it? Truly, science makes us wonder at ourselves, when it claims that man has the power whilst standing here on earth to annihilate the millions and millions of miles that separate us from the sun, and to analyse its composition with the same accuracy with which he analyses the marble or the iron ore which he holds in his hands. It is perhaps a greater marvel that our bodies should possess the physical apparatus and our minds the power of perception and judgment

and reason to detect, interpret and appreciate the meaning of the millions of luminous undulations which are in constant motion around us. Science explains for us the wonderful scientific apparatus called the eye, with all its delicacy and all its precision, with its protective contrivances, with its accommodating lens and the delicate nervous plate which receives the image of the outward object. Of this science gives us what is after all an imperfect account and then fails to explain the more mysterious problem, how by our mind this motion is converted into thought. But the astounding delicacy of the apparatus of sight, reacting with absolute correctness to the millions of vibrations of the ether, unfailingly counting and recording them, and implying a perfect harmony of plan between a man's optical apparatus and the complicated systems of ethereal vibrations and the adaptation of the one to the other and the amazing harmony of the two can not be rationally explained by fortuitious accident. If accident can explain anything, it certainly can not explain so complicated and multifarious a system of harmonies. Only a single cause, intelligent and otherwise, whose power controls the plan and the growth of our eyes, and that means the growth of all our body, as well as the undulating movements of the ether with all their complexity, can account for this harmony. If this be true, then the cause which produces the phenomena of sight is endowed with power which extends from our eyes to the very boundaries of the visible world of stars, to the most distant stellar world whose light, after millions of years of motion, reaches our eyes. And if there be other worlds beyond this, we have no reason to deny that his power extends even to them.

III

We have seen that the cause which has made man's hearing apparatus is also the lord of the air and its

vibrations. We have seen that the cause which has made man's eye is also the lord of the boundless ocean of ether. Science tells us that light and electricity are so closely related that they are but different forms of the same energy. We have every reason to assume a substantial identity of all the cosmic forces. We have learned that the cause which originates and rules and directs light and sound is also the cause of physical man, that is to say, of the human being. Surely this cause is the cause of all that, as far as our knowledge goes, is included in the powers of nature, and its power extends to all the world of our knowledge. This cause is the maker of the world we know, and this cause men call God.

Tolstoy

By G. F. Haspels,
Minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, Rotterdam, Holland.

Some years ago you could find in many houses in Holland a print representing "The Broad and the Narrow Road", in order to illustrate the parable from the Sermon on the Mount in this way: a frivolous crowd walks beside houses of amusement along the well-paved, down-hill road to perdition, but, on a winding and steep path beside a single chapel, a few saints ascend to the Light. The broad and the narrow roads are separated by an insurmountable wall; a small gate only gives admittance to the narrow path: a preacher distributes his tracts with one hand and with the other points to the small gate, for everyone, everyone should go in through the small gate to Life!

A witty friend of mine once made me observe how in this print the preacher was himself standing on the broad way! Is it not tragi-comic? The man who with a deeply affecting voice presses everyone to go in through the small gate to Life, before it is too late—he himself remains standing on the broad way! Yet in what other place should he take his position? within the small gate, on the narrow road? That would be preaching to the converted, which is the same as not to preach. A place between these two does not exist. To preach out of the sky as a *deus ex machina* is equally impossible. If his preaching is to be effective, he must address those who have not yet entered in through the small gate. He has to stay on the broad way and to preach bravely, surrounded by the vulgar noise of the scoffers. But he himself does not go in by the small gate. Is it not tragic?

Preaching in good earnest, he has to take a position as if he were not in earnest. Tragic it is, but grand also. He does not shrink from this desperate position—the only possible place from which to reach them that go to perdition.

Such a tragic and grand preacher is Tolstoy. Preacher? Do we not wrong the great author by calling him a preacher, although he claims that name for himself? No, for even the most artistic of his works is, in the first place, a confession. From his *Childhood*, anonymously published in 1852 at the age of twenty-four, until his death in 1910, the many volumes of his works form a long confession. So upright is he—we can confirm it from his diary—that we all know him just as he knows himself. With great courage and love of truth he tells his experiences, dreams, belief and unbelief. He tells them, however, with invented names; looking at himself with the eye of the artist, he makes from his confession literature. To confess is for him the only way to express himself, just as to express himself in literature becomes for him the only way to live, after he has tried in vain to live in public service, in the army, and as a squire. His *Confession*, published in 1879, is nothing else than taking upon himself the responsibility of all that his heroes had proclaimed; and his conversion which dated from that time is merely the endeavour to put into practice what he hitherto had depicted as the true life. A confession, laying open a lifetime of more than half a century, given with a heart-conquering love of truth by a man who is a nobleman both by birth and by spirit, in the only form in which it was then possible to reach all, in the form of a splendid literary work, so irresistible, therefore, because it is more than literature—can anyone imagine more powerful preaching?

On the first page of *Childhood*, the boy of ten years begins to confess how angry he was with his governor who annoyed him by his efforts to make him an early riser,

and on the second page he regrets his wickedness and loves this governor. This is characteristic of what follows in the later published *Boyhood* and *Early Manhood*. This child, boy and young fellow sees, sees sharply and immediately; sees all the ridiculousness of his governor, of the grown-up people, but mostly of himself. He wants to be perfect—soon his name was "the philosopher"—yet his philosophy shows him nothing but a universe torn to rags, and he feels very poorly on account of his oversensitiveness. One has compassion for this lad who always feels his own pulse, who one day applies himself to asceticism and the next to laziness and honey-cakes, and always finishes with a "*moralischen Katzenjammer*". The fragment published in 1856, *The Morning of a Squire*, shows us his following phase of life. He is that poor squire who neither for himself nor for his farmers can find happiness. Nothing remained for him but to flee from the world. As an ensign he goes to the Caucasus and sketches his experiences among these aborigines in the splendid story, *The Cossacks*. The charm of this tale is that the hero, Olyenin as he calls himself, finds the happiness, sought in vain in the civilized world, with the Cossacks. They put into practice the Rousseau ideal, *retournons à la nature*. They live as nature lives. They know of no other laws than the eternal ones which nature dictated to the sun, the grass, the animal, the tree. Olyenin tries to reach such a life, to become a Cossack, to live at the bosom of nature. He marries a Cossack girl, "beautiful as the first woman come out of the hands of the Creator"—but at the last moment he fails. A man of culture can not become a man of nature. Nevertheless the life remains a tempting ideal for the writer.

Like his hero, he has gone through the Crimean war and the siege of Sevastopol. In these sketches, however, he draws not the excitement but the horribleness of war, and shows especially the bloody, infernal horrors of the lazarettos. A brother officer, Löwenfeld, tells us that he was

the soul of his battery; also that he often made little excursions and, returning as the prodigal son, made a general confession of all his revelries.

After having retired from military service he lived from '55 until '57 as an author at Petersburg, in the company of Tourgénef, Katkof, and others. But he is like Saul among the prophets. For whilst they live for aesthetics only, he can not free himself from ethics. He feels awfully unsatisfied, as we see from this description, given in later days:

"My literary colleagues considered life as a thing developing itself, and us, the men of thought, as the chief instigators of that development. Among the men of thought we, the belletrists and the poets, exert an influence. Our calling is to instruct men. To avoid the question, what and to what aim we had to instruct, it was declared that we instructed unconsciously. I, a belletrist, wrote and instructed —what? I did not know myself. Therefore I received money, had excellent food, a position, women, company; I was known. Accordingly, what I instructed would be good, no doubt."

In those days, however, he believes still in development, and goes abroad in Germany, France, Switzerland, and Italy to study it, from '59 until '61. He troubles himself not much about art. "Art is a lie, and I can no more love the beautiful lie", he writes immediately after his return. On his return he will put in practice what he saw abroad. Theoretically by publishing a pedagogical journal, entitled after his estate *Yásnaya Polyána*, i.e. *a clearing in the forest.* Practically by founding elementary schools on his estate, schools without compulsory instruction, and where the pupils gave the scheme for their lessons. Having overworked himself, however, he had to go to the steppes of South Russia for a cure. On his return he perceives that his schools are suspected by the Government officials as too revolutionary, and he stops his work, having lost his belief in development. A little sketch shows us his mind in these days. *The Three Deceased* tells of the felling of a tree, the death of a man of nature and of a man of culture. The tree dies without pain; the man of nature

with resignation; the man of culture in great agony, troubled in spirit and a terror for his surroundings.

Returning from the steppes, recovered, he married Sophia Andréyevna Behrs. Her grand-parents had still been German Jews, but her father, Doctor Behrs, possessed a country-seat in the neighbourhood of Yásnaya Polyána. The two families met in a friendly way and so they were friends of old. Before the betrothal Tolstoy tells her that he lost a thousand rubles at the billiard table and paid his debt by selling the manuscript of *The Cossacks*, and he also gives her his diary to read. The girl of eighteen years is violently alarmed by this confession, but she risks the leap in the dark, and succeeds. Not long after her marriage the Russian writer Fet describes her in his *Reminiscences* as a perfect type of the Russian gentlewoman. Dressed in white, a big bunch of keys on her belt, she is the heart of the house. Plain, unpretending, merry, always *enceinte*—of her thirteen children nine are still alive, the youngest born in '89—she has time for everything. She herself nurses her children, teaches them till their tenth year, sews their clothes, looks after the household, the kitchen, is the steward of her husband and copies his manuscripts—*Anna Karénina* even ten times!

The happiness of this new life he shows in the gracious sketch *Family Happiness*. As a patriarch amidst his herds and subjects, living with nature, he writes his great novels, *War and Peace*, from '64 to '69, and *Anna Karénina*, from '73 to '75. *War and Peace* is an admirable work, but not an historical novel, as public and writer supposed. The writer desired to give a correction of historiography, for it falsifies; first, because it uses bad authorities such as official reports and tales of eye-witnesses whilst the excitement of the battle permits nobody to see what happens; second, because it applies a bad rule of criticism and glorifies the horrible acts of its heroes.

"*C'est grand!* say the historiographers. *Grand* is good, not-*grand* is bad. Grandness is in their opinion a quality of a particular kind of beings that they call heroes. . . We, who received from Christ the true standard for good and evil, must measure all by that standard. There is no greatness without plainness, goodness and truth."

He considers all men to be egoists and to be led by circumstances. Instead of heroes and leaders, he draws us an infinite procession of men and the idealistic figure of the soldier, Platon Karátayef. But already Tourgénef saw that this is not historiography. The characteristic treatment of the period, the historical colour, the background are totally wanting. The apparently historical details are, indeed, symbolical. The little white hand of Napoleon, returning again and again, in such contrast with his heavy torso, symbolizes the parasite that grows at the expense of others. The heavy, lazy movements of Kutúzof—properly speaking too slow to be called movements—symbolize the lingerer, the conqueror by non-resistance. Platon Karátayef, the incarnation of "what is Russian, good and round", is therefore drawn round. His silhouette and body are round; his smile and brown eyes are round; Pierre even smells something round in Platon's "*Individualduft*". It is easily so with the historical facts and battles. Here you find, not this or that battle, but battle in general. And these men are of no time, men in general, bloodless abstracts from nowhere, the usual material of the revolutionist.

And Pierre—Tolstoy's self-portrait—does not read Diderot or Voltaire, but the diary of Tolstoy. Pierre also finds the above-mentioned plainness, goodness and truth in Platon, the Russian Christian. That wise man says, "Where there is a tribunal there is a lie"; and Pierre experiences this truth both in body and soul. Sharing poverty and imprisonment with this Russian Christian soldier, he learns that poverty and non-resistance give happiness. *War and Peace*, therefore, is no historical novel, but a sermon preached by many splendid, sometimes historical, individuals; a sermon the more touching

because this, like so many great works, is written "in order to get rid of himself", as Goethe said of his *Leiden des jungen Werthers*, but with this difference, that Tolstoy puts the problems too deeply for an aesthetic solution.

Equally, *Anna Karénina* is not a common novel of adultery. Although the writer knows of amusing sin, as he shows us in the person of Oblonsky, the amply drawn adultery of the charming woman, Anna, is not a fascinating history but a detestable sin. And all these persons are sketched with a single touch. They think more than they act, and a single gesture characterizes their whole visualization. Someone laughs: not only his voice but also his eyes, his hands, laugh—is there any writer who understands the language of hands as does Tolstoy?—his words, his thoughts, his gestures, laugh. And it is the same with the animals. A horse, a dog, say a lot of things by one single movement. Merezhkovsky rightly calls Tolstoy a master of *la clairvoyance de la chair*. Finally, the preacher, here named Levin, has all the talk to himself. Before his betrothal Levin confesses his sinful youth. Levin is always trying to become a man of the people (*de se faire peuple*), and hopes there to find his religion which will deliver him from his wealth, luxury and doubts. But Levin-Tolstoy fails here. And so, on the summit of literary glory, Tolstoy is thinking about committing suicide. After having taken off the mask from everyone and from himself, he can not get free of himself. Tourgénef observes directly that Levin-Tolstoy is spiritually not free, and Dostoyévsky that he intends to become as the common people but remains the Moscovite nobleman. His attempt to live like the common people remains imitation, copy, the result of an *esprit de flânerie*, of a physical and moral *esprit de flânerie*. As his self-examination shows him that he can not get free from himself, he must either give up the struggle, or approach the problem from the opposite side, *i. e.*, the side of the

religion of the revelation of God. And with his innate passion he ventures upon the way.

In 1879 appears *My Confession.* With this book he passes from the aesthetic sphere into the ethical. Now he performs what he admits is good. With that great Russian, nearly exotic, humility, the renowned count and author bows himself to stupid popes, confesses, fasts, and tries to find rest in the most petrified of all Churches. But no! To him that Church teaches stupid dogmas, persecutes the "old believers" and sectarians, and leads a helpless youth to the army to be butchered. Then he turns to the sect, that correction of the Church. Usually heretics are called *Joerodjiwej,* which can be translated both by *innocent* and by *saint.* At times within the Church, then out of it, they are wanderers, giving a primitive imitation of Him who was walking about on earth, doing good. These wandering heretics were always admired by Tolstoy. In *Childhood* he had already depicted such a *joerodjiwej,* Grischa, a bare-footed giant, who wore chains on his naked body and always prayed and prophesied. He will not imitate them, however. As a thoroughbred heretic he will find his own way,—a characteristic way!

In the first place, he cuts out with the chopping knife of criticism a new path through the lianas of ecclesiastical tradition. In *Reason and Dogma* he concludes that the doctrine of the Church is only an antiquated lie and an imposture. Afterwards he gives *A Short Exposition of the Gospel,* that is to say, of the original Gospel. Is it not difficult to discover this? Not at all! Strike out from the New Testament everything except the four Gospels and the first Epistle of St. John, remove out of this remnant all miracles—and you have left the Gospel, twelve chapters, no more, no less. In *My Faith,* from '87, he tells why the doctrine of non-resistance is the key of his gospel. Nobody believes the Sermon on the Mount.

The Church calls it divine doctrine, yet not to be fulfilled on account of our human weakness. Worldly wisdom appreciates it highly—as the bigotry of a dreamer. But he will conquer it. Finally he reads Matthew V with a rabbi. This man said repeatedly: "This is not original; this is taken from the Old Testament or from the Talmud", till they came to verses 38 and 39: "You have heard that it was said—An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. I, however, say to you that you must not resist wrong; but, if anyone strike you on the right cheek, turn the other to him also." Now the rabbi does not say, "This has already been said", but he asks jeeringly, "Do Christians fulfil this command?" Tolstoy remains silent. He knows that at that moment the so-called Christians persecute the Jews. But he sees clearly that this is the doctrine of Christ; the State, with its regulated brute force, its war, tribunals, prisons, and its protection of the usurpers,—*the Christian State is the Antichrist.* This revolutionary book is naturally interdicted in Russia and therefore becomes so popular that its refutation is a common examination question at the theological seminaries—a characteristic specimen of the kind-heartedness of that severe Russia.

Having, since 1881, lived during the winter in Moscow, he sees also the misery of the poor. He will aid them in the usual way with money that the rich supply. So, in the winter of '91 one hundred and fifty thousand rubles were forwarded to him, principally from England and America. As always, he tells of his experiences in tracts, such as *How Is My Life? What Then Must We Do?* and others. He sees that money does not make men happy; on the contrary, it creates unhappiness. To give money to the poor is not to love them. To part with money, and return from the town to mother earth and live by manual labour—that is the very thing. Simple enough,—on paper; but his wife says, "I can not send my children into the world on God's mercy, as nobody does so."

Domestic difficulties arise. The woman who is his steward and secretary remains, in the first place, mother. They come to an agreement, the terms of the compromise being, according to his brother-in-law Behrs, that Tolstoy rid himself of all his money and possessions, with this single exception, that he should live under the roof of Yásnaya Polyána. Is it not tragic? Here is a man who, in obedience to Christ, deserts his wife and children and fortune—with this single exception, that he does not desert them. His wife sews for him the clothes of a moujik—is it such a sacrifice to change our horrible "fashionable dress" for the easy national costume? It is his wife who procures for him the garden-house in Moscow, in Yásnaya Polyána, a quiet cell, and always a nourishing vegetarian diet—is not the sacrifice mostly on her side? He feels the tragedy of his position. Add to this that the heretics, always so much admired by Tolstoy, always aimed at chastity, and we are in the neighbourhood of the *Kreutzer Sonata*, from '90. This most read but least successful of his works is, perhaps, to be excused as a gesture of despair, an effort to throw the blame for his tragic position upon his marriage. Will not his wife, in copying the work in her fair handwriting, have smiled, considering that their youngest child was only one year old? Certainly not he, but she, is here the non-resistant. And noble are her words concerning this, in all respects, raw *Kreutzer Sonata:* "I do not consider it the most successful work of my husband." She is here the woman at her fairest, the woman above all mother,—mother of her children, mother also of her husband, her biggest boy.

That Tolstoy in the meanwhile remains the greatest writer of Russia is proved by his *Popular Tales*. If the tendency has too large a place here, it is one and all in his last novel, *Resurrection*. Again a confession of the too well-known Prince Nekhlúdof-Tolstoy! Again a complaint against the town, against the landed proprietors,

against the State with its militarism, and against the Church with its lies! Nekhlúdof, made a sinner by the wicked organization of our life, celebrates his *resurrection* by following the girl he seduced on her way of penitence to Siberia.

And this preaching in the form of a novel he repeats again in a number of tracts. The Church excommunicates him; his family fears that, like Nekhlúdof, he will really go to Siberia. He persists in preaching against worldly and ecclesiastical government, like the wandering heretics and revolutionists, and never is he so near to them as on the day when, dangerously ill, he flees at last from Yásnaya Polyána, and dies on his wanderings, at the little station of Astápovo.

The general opinion, Tolstoy a great writer but a preacher who has failed, is unsatisfying. First, because he himself condemns all his aesthetic works as sinful and vain; secondly, because he owes his great influence (his biographer Birukof, as early as 1904, records fifty million copies of his works in Russia and translations of them into forty-five languages) to his monotonous, badly-composed, but very touching and affecting preaching, not to his belletristical works; finally, because in accordance with the axiom of forms and contents, his personality must be the result of these two.

And this man is great by reason of his personality, for he is a representative man. Not one of the many-sided, universal men that live for all time, not a Plato, Paulus, Goethe or Vinet; nor one of the one-sided, one of the unmatched thinkers who find a new way of looking at life, as Leibnitz, Rousseau, Kierkegaard. No, as a writer, he has his superiors; as a preacher, his defects; as a thinker, a rare lack of originality. But as a person, he is great, very great. At the same time little, very little —and these contrasts are so amalgamated that it forms

his particular greatness and makes him a representative of our time.

That this representative man is a Russian makes the case the more complicated. For we do not understand the Russians—and the Russians understand themselves still less. And yet this Russian would be the light of this time—and that by his self-knowledge! How could that be? Now, the problem can be appreciated in an historical or in a theological way. In the first case, we say: Tolstoy is the combination of an Anabaptist or a Puritan and a Buddhist. Rather, I should say: he is a mediaeval heretic, like the Cathares and the Waldenses[1]; moreover, Russia is at this moment where Western Europe was in the time of those heretics. So, Tolstoy may be an eminent leader for his country, while for us he is a retrograde step. In the second case, we say: Tolstoy has discovered the Gospel. But this discovery affects him in this manner: he reads no further than Matthew V—VII, yea, he obliterates all that follows. His gospel, too, is, and will remain, an amorphous hybrid.

In both cases the problem is well put but not solved, for this solution does not explain how this Russian evangelist, with his one-sidedness and mediaeval thoughts, could have such an influence on our many-sided, disbelieving time. Instead of attempting to solve the problem, we will trace the composing parts. This Russian is a representative child of our time. He hardly knew his father, and his mother he did not know at all. He is educated by foreign governors—and by himself. So are many and many children of our generation educated by instructors and by themselves, because their parents, not understanding our time, dared not and could not educate their children, and had no more influence over them than if they had been dead. This badly equipped boy soon perceives the lies of the world, of the common and of the ecclesiastical world, and he becomes a believer

[1] Compare my *Non-Resistance*, pp. 92–4.

in almighty science. But, with his science, grow his passions, his disbelief and despair—and this incurable affliction and pride—what else are they but the mental disease of each child of our age? He seeks recovery in nature and in manual and literary labour. He, the aristocrat, *se fait peuple*, and gives of this conversion a report that becomes a confession.

Why does that *retournons à la nature* of Rousseau sound so strikingly in Tolstoy's mouth? Because this old sigh of a dying civilization—never to be considered as a new gospel—rises from the depths of his heart, his personality. Returning to nature, for him, means to come to himself, to become himself.

"The influence of spring is such on me . . . that I sometimes fancy myself to be a plant. . . In this season there happens in me a transformation, a purification, a sudden change, such as no one could imagine who had not undergone the same sensation. The old creature has passed. All worldly passions, all indolence, all vice, all nonsense, all compassion, yea, all repentance, have given place to an uncommon flower that unfurls its leaves and grows with the spring."

So he writes in a communication to his aunt, Countess A. A. Tolstoy, in 1858! One year also before the publishing of the *Origin of Species* the barrier between nature and man is effaced by him. Thence follows the original similarity of man and animal. Long before the publication of *The Descent of Man*, this novel writer has also swept away the illusion that man is a being to be separated from the rest of creation. So Tolstoy is a Darwinist *avant la lettre*. The poet has beheld beforehand what science will afterwards make acceptable. The general opinion is that in consequence of his conversion to vegetarianism he pictures the colour and the crying of the pig as human because he wishes to give us an aversion to meat-eating, but, on the contrary, the truth is that his vegetarianism is nothing but an application of his Darwinism *avant la lettre*. Long before Darwin the poet has effaced the limit between man and animal. Long before Zola Tolstoy has seen *la bête humaine* and has depicted it in a finer way than

the other did. He could do that because he knew nature as he knew himself. Therefore, in this regard also, he remains the nobleman, as Zola will always remain the plebeian.

After having found this truth he concludes: if in nature the different species pass into each other, why should these species, these different positions and classes, subsist in society, which ought to be formed in accordance with nature? State and Church, which sanction the separation of men into classes, corrupt life. Therefore the Mammon, money, the idol that creates the classes, is the anti-God, the anti-Christ. *Se faire peuple*, to return to the common people, is the first step to happiness. So this poet becomes, in the second place, a Marxist *avant la lettre*. It is true that among the foreign books that influenced him Tolstoy counted the Gospel of St. Matthew, *Confessions* and *Emile* by Rousseau, and *David Copperfield*, by Dickens, but neither Marx nor Darwin. He did not want them because he had already seen as a whole what they found by degrees. His democracy and socialistic communism is rather the result arrived at by a solitary, poetical seeker after truth than the programme of a leader of the people—and this has probably saved him from banishment to Siberia.

In this manner we also approximate best his conversion, for in the common scheme of aversion, repentance, and reversion, his conversion is not to be comprehended. Only the aversion, the breaking with the faith of his youth, is a fixed point. Not once, but a thousand times, he repents and begins a new life till his last tragic wandering. By any means he comes to conversion—and that as a representative man of our time. Without father or mother, as is said of so many old prophets, this seeker after truth has found on the way of worldly wisdom the truth that is not of this world, religion—religion, however, in the sense of popular belief. His returning to God is also returning to the people and returning to nature.

He unifies man with nature, but, seeing nature as a creation of God, he brings man back to God. Our objection that this pantheism is something else than the Gospel of Jesus Christ does not strike this Russian, this mystical heretic, because he contemplates the cosmical significance of Christ and philosophizes about the Creation by the Word and the Incarnation of the Word more than we do. In fact, he still lives in the Middle Ages. Therefore, he possesses that universal religion and feels in himself that never-ceasing urgency to manifest his belief by social work and that absolute absence of scepticism that for us are the attractive and powerful characteristics of the Middle Ages. So his returning to nature and to the popular belief becomes a return to Christianity. Thus this Darwinist and Marxist *avant la lettre* is a precursor of the return to religion, a return that in our days we more feel as a coming, than see as a happening, thing.

Notwithstanding this, we are obliged to speak of his conversion as of a *so-called* conversion, and this is the unspeakable tragedy of this grand man. Tragic is his return to the people, for at the moment he realizes his long-cherished dream it turns out a caricature. He wears peasant's clothing, but everybody is quite sure that this peasant is a nobleman, dressing after his own fashion. He labours in the fields, but his labouring is never, "No mill no meal." For his loving wife and his doctor take care that it remains a healthy sport. He lives in the country—yes, in summer, in the large park of Yásnaya Polyána. Certainly he does not wish to be the epicurist who grants himself the refined luxury of a simplified life, nor "the rich man playing the part of Lazarus." He will return to the people, but he remains the squire who strolls among ordinary men, yet has not become one of them. A cobweb only separates him from the admired people, and that cobweb he can not sweep away, the poor hero!

Tragic also is his aversion of Mammon, that personification of the world. Certainly he is afraid of wealth—microbes of all the passions stick on it. In his rage of purifying he will part with it. He does so, and lo! the careful mother of his many children looks after the indispensable money. He declines to receive it for his work—she knows as well how to make a contract with the publishers as to correct his proofsheets. He flies from the money—it seeks him. He curses it, and it blesses him. Finally, he keeps silent in non-resistant resignation—and he always grows richer. Each word against money brings money to him, even after his death. He leaves this last will; Yásnaya Polyána shall be for the persons who have a legal claim to it, for his farmers; under this condition, however, that his family can buy it back out of the proceeds of his writings. So, at the last moment money can undo what he wanted to do with all his might, poor hero!

And, above all, tragical in his conversion. Conversion always gives joy and confraternity. For the converted the fatted calf is killed, and they begin to make merry. For Tolstoy, the festival of life has never dawned. He knows the glorious duty; he does not know the infinitely more glorious grace. The persons in his novels lack liberty, joy. They are victims who without resistance endure their lives, till they conclude that it is their duty to convert themselves. He possesses honesty, earnestness, moral will and perseverance, but in gaining all this, he loses the joy of salvation. In this aspect his first writings are more Christian than his later. When he discovers his gospel, this discovery takes away from him the joy of life. Duty on duty, and rule on rule, is going to be the monotonous motto of his life. But music and dancing and merry-making, inseparable from the religion that is also the poetry of truth, are looked for in vain in his last work. In the beginning, after his conversion, he tries to fraternize with his surroundings and to play the kind

Lord Bountiful of the country, but soon he parts with philanthropy to become the rigid moralizer. So he has sought confraternity, community, but has not found them. The *barine* may try to become a *moujik;* on coming to the *moujiks*, he reads in their mocking eyes that he remains a *barine.* This grand man of genius may admire the little heretics; they do not understand why he does not join them, and they suspect him, the bravest man of his time, of being afraid of persecution. This intellectual becomes a non-consecrated preacher of the Gospel, but the Stundists, who are anti-ecclesiastical and free-evangelical, shake their heads over his not understanding the pith and marrow of the Gospel. In fact, I do not know a more lonely man than this preacher of charity and community. That loneliness, how he must have felt it, as from day to day there came to see him insatiable reporters and admiring globe-trotters of Europe, Asia and America!

This loneliness is the sour fruit of his conversion which is not up to the mark. He loves Christ, the truth-teaching and coming Christ, but the present Christ is a scandal unto him. All that he received from Christ, he will apply without Christ. Hence his lack of joy, his loneliness, his standstill, and at last his decline. The reader of his last so-called Christian tracts is alarmed on account of his backsliding in religion. In fact, his *Childhood*, of 1852, is much more religious than his *What Is Religion?* of 1902. And with awe we remember that mighty word of the Gospel: "From him who has nothing even that which he has will be taken away."

And yet this tragical ending seems unavoidable; it is the price of his greatness. As another John the Baptist he has seen Christ from a distance and prophesied his glory; but he has taken offence at the present Christ who has brought another kingdom than he expected. What is solely Russian in him we must lay aside as *terra incognita*

to us, but we have to recognize in him the John the Baptist of our time. This representative man has shown his contemporaries what alone gives happiness, and what they especially had lost, the belief in God. He has done this in the form most acceptable for our time: he, the greatest author of his country, has not been ashamed to become a preacher. He has done this in the way most proper for our time: he, the realist, has become an idealist. *Il a payé de sa personne*, not least since by his touching and honest end he raised the tragedy of his whole life to a higher level. And finally, he has done this by preaching religion, not from its theoretical but from its practical side. So he has been a hand-post to the unconverted, but also to the regenerated, to them who are farther on the way than he himself.

His pointing others onward, farther than he is himself—he a realist who does not want to appear to be more than he is—his urging every one to go in by the small gate of Life, whilst he himself, for the sake of his preaching, remains on the broad way: this is the contradiction and the tragedy of his life. This leaves us standing unsatisfied before this giant. He was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord; but as he was only a crying voice, not a personality full of peace, his lifework has been to procure a homeopathic antidote, not to give us normal food. Imitation not only turns out to be mimicry, but is here impossible, for no one of his epigones possesses his voice, a voice that governs the wilderness of the world. And, most of all, he can not give them the freedom that is indispensable for imitation, because he possesses none himself. Will someone say: "But when he fled from Yásnaya Polyána, and in the snowstorm faced death, he became free, himself a personality."—I will not deny that. To me also this spontaneous act seems not only to be, from an aesthetic aspect, a beautiful end to his life but also an ethically satisfying close of his heavy task. But his first and last

step to freedom lies wholly outside of our knowledge and appreciation.

So far as we know him, we say: A mighty voice to proclaim the truth, not truth personified, not an incarnate voice. But what needs our time so much as this voice? If the children of today will listen to his voice, this wrestler has not struggled in vain, and is preaching still after his death.

THIS BOOK IS DUE:

APR 28 1917

JA 27 53

CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY VOL. 3 1915

APR 26 1917

SEP 20 1923

JA 27 '53

'53

CBPaU

GTU Library

3 2400 00273 0467